Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-126
Monday
1 July 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-126 *1 July 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Final Warsaw Pact Committee Meeting in Prague 1
Yanayev Heads Delegation *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Bessmertnykh: End 'Natural' *[TASS]* 1
Official on Pact Disbandment *[INTERFAX]* 1
Delegation Departs for Prague *[TASS]* 2
Arrival for Pact Meeting *[Radio Rossii]* 2
Yanayev Remarks on CSFR, Pact *[TASS]* 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Primakov on Washington Visit, U.S. Aid *[MOSCOW NEWS no. 23]* 3
'Objective' View of Soviet Army's Role Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]* 3

China

Polozkov Meeting With Jiang Zemin Reported *[TASS]* 4
Reportage on Sino-Soviet Border Talks 5
Foreign Ministry Comments *[INTERFAX]* 5
Churkin on Reports 'Twisting' Facts *[Moscow International]* 5
Agreement on Use of Amur River by Chinese Ships *[Moscow International]* 6
70th Anniversary of CPC Commemorated 6
Central Committee Sends Greetings *[TASS]* 6
CPC Development Viewed *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 6
Veterans Official Evaluates Recent PRC Visit *[Moscow International]* 8

Northeast Asia

LDP Parliamentary Group Visits Khabarovsk *[Moscow International]* 9
Japanese Official Says Survey Team Plans Visit *[Moscow International]* 11
Mitsubishi Branch Office Opens in Siberia *[Moscow International]* 11

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan Reportedly To Buy Weapons From PRC *[Moscow International]* 12
Commentary on Skirmishes in Kashmir *[Moscow International]* 12
Nishanov Meets With Sri Lankan Delegation *[TASS]* 13
'Pressure' on Jordan on Palestinian Issue Seen *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 13

Sub-Saharan Africa

Soviet Union-South Africa Society Created *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 13
Academic on Association *[Moscow International]* 13
Ministry Welcomes Pretoria's Nuclear Decision *[Moscow International]* 14
Commentary Views Latest Developments in RSA *[Moscow International]* 14
Ignatenko: 'Looking Forward' to Mandela Visit *[INTERFAX]* 15
Ambassador to Mozambique Replaced *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 15

East Europe

Reportage on Crisis in SFRY 15
Foreign Ministry Issues Statement *[TASS]* 15
Pavlov Condemns Use of Force *[Vienna Radio]* 16
Pavlov Advocates Political Solution of Crisis *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 29 Jun]* 16
Round up of Developments *[TASS]* 16
Steps Taken To Ensure Soviet's Safety *[TASS]* 17
Pavlov Meets Austrian Businessmen *[TASS]* 17
Bessmertnykh, Yanayev Visit Czechoslovakia 17
Yanayev 'Optimistic' on Relations *[TASS]* 17
Both Meet Havel *[TASS]* 18
Bessnertnykh Meets Dienstbier *[TASS]* 18
Yanayev Meets Prime Minister *[TASS]* 18
Yanayev on 'New' Relations With CSFR *[TASS]* 18
Dashichev Says Tank Use Thwarted in GDR *[Berlin ADN]* 19
East European States Said To Oppose Aid *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Jun]* 19
Traffic Piles Up at Polish Border *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 20
Protection of Former E. European Leaders Urged *[INTERFAX]* 20
Foreign Ministry Official on Withdrawals *[INTERFAX]* 20

West Europe

Pavlov Continues Visit to Austria 21
Pavlov Meets Waldheim *[TASS]* 21
Discusses Cooperation With Fischer *[TASS]* 21
Holds News Conference With Vranitzky *[TASS]* 21
Completes Talks *[Moscow TV]* 22
Leaves Salzburg for Moscow *[TASS]* 22
Vranitzky on Visit *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Jun]* 22
Vranitzky on Trade *[IZVETIYA 27 Jun]* 22
Germans Disguised as Soviet Servicemen Detained *[TASS]* 23
German Detained at Soviet Facilities in Golssen *[TASS]* 23
Koivisto on Relations With USSR, RSFSR *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 24
Mafia Trying To Produce Drugs in USSR *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 24

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuba's Aldana Visits Moscow 24
Meets Gorbachev *[TASS]* 24
Talks With Yanayev *[Moscow TV]* 25
Talks With Frolov *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 25
Opinions Divided on Survival of Castro Regime *[INTERFAX]* 25
Chilean Businessmen Continue Visit 25
Minister Gives Letter to Gorbachev *[Moscow International]* 25
Primakov Talks With Chilean Minister *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 26
RSFSR Minister on Business Links *[INTERFAX]* 26
Cooperation Agreement Signed *[Moscow International]* 26
Agreement Reached on Relations With Belize *[TASS]* 27

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Heated Debate Over Privatization Law *[Moscow Radio]* 28
Draft Law Adopted *[INTERFAX]* 28
Supreme Soviet Discusses Employment Problems *[INTERFAX]* 28
Supreme Soviet Session 28 June *[Moscow TV]* 29

Political & Social

Opinions Vary on Purpose of Proposed New Party *[INTERFAX]* 30
Shevardnadze Urges 'Constructive Opposition' *[INTERFAX]* 30
Union, Republic Foreign Ministers Meet 31
Discuss Chernobyl *[TASS]* 31
Bessmertnykh Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 31
Internal Affairs Ministers Discuss Crime *[Moscow TV]* 32
Constitution Compliance Committee News Conference *[TASS]* 33
Gorbachev Chairs CPSU Draft Program Meeting *[TASS]* 34
Gorbachev Message to Red Cross, Crescent Congress *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 34
2d Congress of Soviet Republican Party Opens *[TASS]* 34
Yakovlev Responds to Newspaper Reports *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 29 Jun]* 34
Government, Media View Information Policy *[TASS]* 35
MOSCOW NEWS Questions OMON Role, Aims *[No 23]* 35
Bovin Berates Critics of Shevardnadze Legacy *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 36
Problems in Press Distribution Considered *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 39
Deputy Takes Lukyanov to Court for Power Abuse *[Radio Rossii]* 41
'Social Benefit' of Nazarbayev Prestige Eyed *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 41
TASS Reviews 1 July PRAVDA 42
TASS Reviews 29 June Soviet Central Press 43

Economic

Yazov Notes 'Enormous Strain' Placed on Army *[TASS]* 44
Addresses Young Communists *[TASS]* 45
Army Komsomol Rally Ends; Officials Elected *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]* 45
Defense Cuts Hampering Space Research, Design *[TASS]* 45
Air Defense Forces Status, Future Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 46
Cabinet Allocates Food for Officers, Families *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 50

Agricultural

Tomsk Bans Reservists From Harvest Battalions *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 50
Chernoivanov Interviewed on 1991 Prospects *[ZEMLYA I LYUDI No 23-24]* 50

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts Carry Out Second Space Walk *[TASS]* 53
Space Walk Details Reported *[TASS]* 53
Italian Astronaut Invited to Mir Complex *[TASS]* 54
Interrepublic Nuclear Safety Council Set Up *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 54
Germans Help Monitor Chernobyl Contamination *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 54

Economic

Yazov Notes 'Enormous Strain' Placed on Army *[TASS]* 54
Addresses Young Communists *[TASS]* 55
Army Komsomol Rally Ends; Officials Elected *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]* 55
Defense Cuts Hampering Space Research, Design *[TASS]* 55
Air Defense Forces Status, Future Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 56
Cabinet Allocates Food for Officers, Families *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 60

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council Leaders Meet in Riga 28 June *[BALTFAX]* 61
Savisaar Briefs Council on Pavlov Talks *[BALTFAX]* 61
Decision on Economic Relations Adopted *[Vilnius International]* 61
Main Points of Economic Ties Detailed *[BALTFAX]* 62

Backdrop to Savisaar No-Confidence Vote Noted *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 62
Savisaar Meets Swedish Transport Minister *[Tallinn Radio]* 63
Estonia's Ruutel Views Baltic Issues *[Tallinn Radio]* 64
Estonia Abolishes State Prices for Food *[Moscow TV]* 64
Next Round of Estonian-USSR Talks 6 Aug *[Tallinn Radio]* 64
Further Reportage on Reaction to OMON Activities 65
Troops Acted in Accordance With Decree *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 65
Stankevicius Concerned Over Raid *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]* 65
Minister Cables Pugo on OMON Attack *[BALTFAX]* 66
Pugo Concerned About OMON Activities *[Radio Rossii]* 66
OMON Commander on 26 Jun Events *[TASS]* 67
OMON Commanders 'Seriously Warned' *[TASS]* 67
Omon Role in Customs Attacks Noted *[MOSCOW NEWS No. 23]* 67
Youth Daily Comments on OMON Actions *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 68
Doguzhiyev on USSR-Vilnius Dialogue Problems *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 70
Vilnius Official on Doguzhiyev's Pressure *[Vilnius International]* 71
Vagnorius Sends Telegrams on Ties With USSR *[Vilnius International]* 72
Landsbergis on 'Political Protection' From West *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]* 72
Vilnius Military Chiefs' Transfers Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]* 72

RSFSR

28 Jun RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported *[Moscow Russian TV]* 73
Silayev Gives Address *[Moscow Russian TV]* 75
Silayev Answers Deputies' Questions *[Moscow Russian TV]* 77
Concern Over SFRY Events Expressed *[TASS]* 78
USSR Production Decision Rejected *[Moscow Radio]* 79
Prime Minister Silayev Discusses Economy *[Moscow Russian TV]* 79
Silayev Urges 'Stern Opposition' to Planning Law *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]* 83
Coalition Government Agreement Being Drafted *[Radio Rossii]* 84
Yeltsin Thanks Campaign Workers at Soiree *[Radio Rossii]* 84
Yeltsin Arrives in Novosibirsk 1 July *[TASS]* 84
'Who's Who' Features Leningrad's Sobchak *[Moscow TV]* 84
Sobchak Sorbonne Remarks on Gorbachev Quoted *[SOVETKSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Jun]* 86
Sobchak Makes Congratulatory Speech for Yeltsin *[Radio Rossii]* 86
Sobchak Inaugurated as Leningrad Mayor *[TASS]* 87
PRAVDA Views Leningrad Name Change *[26 Jun]* 87

Caucasus

Georgia Appeals to UN for Support, Membership *[Tbilisi Radio]* 87
Nagorno-Karabakh Village Attacked 28 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 88
Official Says Firms Under Azerbaijan Authority *[ARMENPRES]* 88
Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Receives French Group *[ARMENPRES]* 88
Mutalibov Warns Against Separatists in Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* 89

Central Asia

Kazakhstan Seeks Union Treaty Amendments *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]* 89
Approves Privatization Program *[INTERFAX]* 89
Kyrgyzstan President Praises Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 90
Tajik Deputies Support Draft Union Treaty *[Dushanbe Radio]* 90
Tajik Supreme Soviet Lifts State of Emergency *[TASS]* 90
Confirms KGB Appointment *[TASS]* 90
Turkministan's Muradov Supports Union Treaty *[Moscow International]* 91
More on Treaty Support *[TASS]* 91

Final Warsaw Pact Committee Meeting in Prague

Yanayev Heads Delegation

LD2806124791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1030 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Preparations are being completed in Prague for the meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, where a protocol will be signed ending the existence of this organization. Our correspondent Vladimir Taranov:

[Taranov] Working groups of experts who will complete the work on the draft documents are continuing to gather in Prague. Foreign correspondents are not far behind. The latters' interest in this event has exceeded all the expectations of the organizers. It has become known that the Soviet delegation at the meeting in Prague will be headed by USSR Vice President Yanayev. Michal Zantovsky, the CSFR president's press spokesman, stated that the Soviet president would not be able to come to Prague, evidently because he is occupied with internal political problems. Political observers immediately drew the conclusion that the arrival of the presidents of Poland and Hungary in Prague is also in great doubt.

At the same time the question of what the countries of eastern Europe will do after leaving the Warsaw Pact is arousing increased interest. The supposition that they could join NATO has now been fully repudiated both by top NATO representatives and by the leadership of the countries of Eastern Europe. The Czechoslovak side favors improving the system of European cooperation within the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and for expanding all-round contacts with NATO countries.

Bessmertnykh: End 'Natural'

LD3006153691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 30 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jun—The meeting of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of Warsaw Pact member states, which opens in Prague on Monday, will evidently be the last, and the relevant documents will be signed at it confirming that this alliance is ceasing to exist, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, the USSR foreign minister, has stated.

In an interview given journalists in Minsk on Friday evening at the conclusion of the third meeting of the council of foreign ministers of the USSR and the sovereign republics, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said that the first step toward this decision was taken during the spring in Budapest, when the fate of the alliance's military organization was determined.

Life has shown that the Warsaw Pact played its positive role in the preceding decades, when Europe was divided into conflicting blocs and "rival halves" and when there was a military threat on the threshold, the minister emphasized. Naturally, the alliance at that time ensured the security both of the Soviet Union and its allies.

Now as events show, the need for this has vanished, and deep changes are occurring in eastern and central Europe, throughout the entire continent, and indeed throughout the world as a whole. The head of the Soviet foreign affairs department therefore considers that "what is dying off naturally ought not to be maintained artificially." "The coming decision in Prague seems to me natural," Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated.

How then will relations between the Soviet Union and the states of eastern and central Europe develop in the future? According to Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, the USSR's relations with all the countries of the region are already at the present time "being transferred on to a new basis in international law." In his view, future links will become more durable, because "the states are entering into new bilateral treaties and agreements with the Soviet Union voluntarily, after pondering their own fate." According to the minister, such a readiness does exist on their part. A treaty has already been concluded with Romania, and corresponding documents with other states of the area are at various stages of being elaborated.

The new relationships, the USSR foreign minister noted in conclusion, are meant to form a stronger and more reliable link between eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Official on Pact Disbandment

OW0107074891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report by diplomatic correspondent Mikhail Mayorov: "Warsaw Pact Sets an Example of Non-Alliance Thinking"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] With Warsaw Pact's military structures overhauled in February, its Political Consultative Committee is due to meet in Prague on July 1 to wind up the organisation's political activity.

The deputy in charge of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Mr. Sergey Zotov, told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent that the Pact was setting similar closed structures in Europe an example of non-alliance thinking in line with the resolutions of last November's CSE conference in Paris. Mr Zotov said his country's actions must match its perceptions of a future Europe.

In his view, one reason why the Warsaw Pact must be overhauled is because the Soviet Union stands to lose by its continuance. He said the sharing of quotas of troops and armaments among the Pact members was often done at the cost of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet diplomat said the Warsaw Pact had played a positive role in maintaining a military-political balance in Europe. He said that given the current change in Europe, it would be appropriate to raise the question of eliminating both the Warsaw Pact and NATO. However, he said "we realise that such structures as NATO cannot disappear overnight", but the continuance of the Atlantic alliance runs counter to the realities in the continent where the process of greater security and cooperation is gaining in strength.

Expressing his own view, Mr Zotov said last year's call by Soviet diplomacy for politicising NATO must now be taken off the agenda. NATO leaders have seen this as a chance for expanding areas of the organisation's activity and competence and for its turning into "a universal instrument" in Europe. Mr Zotov said it would be tantamount to immortalising NATO, something the Soviet Union does not want to happen.

Delegation Departs for Prague

LD3006093491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0919 GMT 30 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jun (TASS)—USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev left Moscow today for Prague to take part in the work of the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee.

At the airport he was seen off by Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, and other officials.

Arrival for Pact Meeting

LD3006135991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1230 GMT 30 Jun 91

[Text] USSR Vice President Yanayev and Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh arrived today in Prague, where they will attend the meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee.

Yanayev Remarks on CSFR, Pact

LD3006205391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1421 GMT 30 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague, 30 Jun (TASS)—USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev arrived in Prague today. He will be taking part in the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact member states, which opens tomorrow.

The Soviet delegation includes Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR foreign minister, and other officials.

G. Yanayev was met at the airport by Zdenek Matejka, CSFR deputy foreign minster, and also by Boris Pankin, USSR ambassador in the CSFR.

Relations between the USSR and the CSFR are now entering a qualitatively new phase, and are developing on a new basis, G. Yanayev told journalists. The impetus for this came from the Moscow talks between Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and Vaclav Havel in February last year, and from the visits to the Soviet Union by Aleksandr Dubcek and Marian Calfa. I have an optimistic view of the development of relations between our countries. They must be given a treaty basis. Elaboration of this treaty is nearing completion. I am convinced that the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will seek out every opportunity to sign this document.

The direction of our bilateral relations, noted the USSR vice president, is in accordance not only with the interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and of Czechoslovakia—it furthers the pan-European process, in the development of which Warsaw Pact member states have made a decisive contribution. What has happened, for example, in the disarmament field was made possible thanks to Warsaw Pact initiatives.

United States & Canada

Primakov on Washington Visit, U.S. Aid

PM2806155491 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 23, 9-16 Jun 91 p 13

[Interview with Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, by Dmitriy Yakushkin; date, place not given; first paragraph is introduction: "From the Position of Realism"]

[Text] Member of the USSR Security Council Yevgeniy Primakov was in Washington for a series of discussions with American political figures and business people. The Soviet envoys were received by George Bush.

[Yakushkin] What is your impression of the discussions you held?

[Primakov] Very favourable. We had an opportunity to explain our positions to the American side. The Americans heard our explanations and commented. Neither side was subjected to cross-examination. Those were meetings of equals.

[Yakushkin] You said the Americans had a mistaken view of our programmes. What did you have in mind?

[Primakov] In the past our negotiators used to come for talks with previous instructions and present the official position. Today we have the opposite. Americans often get their ideas from uninformed people or those who intentionally give them wrong information because they are opposed to the government. The Americans did not know that the government programme had been modified and that it called for stabilization in the context of privatization, denationalization, the freeing of prices and a general movement towards a market system. We have explained all that, and I think that Americans found it useful to understand where our government is headed.

We differed from the Americans on the question of whether all checks should be lifted at once. We can't do that because it would lead to chaos from which it would be difficult to extricate the country.

[Yakushkin] Did you discuss Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's appearance in Harvard?

[Primakov] He took part in most of the discussion. Incidentally, I did not like Vladimir Gurevich's article in MN because it creates an absolutely wrong impression of what is taking place. The whole point is not that Yavlinskiy is busy doing something that is viewed as an alternative to Gorbachev's or the government's policy. Yavlinskiy is in Boston with the approval of the Soviet President and the developing ideas of the President. The idea is that this country's progress towards a market system, the extent of radicalization of the process, and the time frame all greatly depend upon the kind of support the West is prepared to give. This help must be matched by real progress on our part. The article however said that Yavlinskiy was not happy with what the government was doing and therefore he took a trip to the U.S. to produce some new programme. This is not so. I would like to stress—this logically emerges from the President's idea—the government programme can be freely adapted should we get corresponding support, aid, and cooperation from the West.

[Yakushkin] Did you discuss Soviet participation in the Group of Seven conference?

[Primakov] It was naturally discussed. There has been some progress on it but I can't say a definite decision was reached.

[Yakushkin] There are lots of rumours about the extent of Western aid to the USSR. Some even cite a specific sum.

[Primakov] The sum appeared through a misunderstanding. Mikhail Gorbachev said the following: if it was worth 100 billion [currency not specified] to end the conflict in the Gulf, then it's worth 100 billion to make sure pereestroika succeeds. This is where the sum of 100 billion came from. Professor Sachs one of the group of U.S. experts at Harvard, named the sum of 30 billion in credits each year. We did not discuss any sum and it would be wrong to think that we arrived there cap in hand asking for some specific amount. How much money can be advanced, with what strings and for what should be worked out by experts.

'Objective' View of Soviet Army's Role Noted

PM2806161391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by N. Petrov: "On the Role of the Military in Soviet Politics. View from Capitol Hill"]

[Text] In June this year the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the role of the military in the Soviet Union and its influence on the USSR's foreign and domestic policies or, still more accurately, its influence on the progress of the economic and political reforms being implemented in our country.

Discussion of the state of affairs in a foreign state with which the United States is developing multifaceted ties is perfectly topical and justified, since the further expansion or, conversely, freezing of Soviet-U.S. contacts in various spheres largely depends on the degree of trust existing between the two countries' political, business, and military circles. It is understandable that the U.S. side wants to gauge its political course in respect of the USSR more accurately and to ensure its corresponding acceptance by the U.S. general public. For it is no secret that at present far from everyone in the United States looks with understanding on the current reforms in the Soviet Union or expresses readiness to contribute to the development of the positive processes occurring in our country.

In a recent interview Captain S.A. Yonov, naval attache at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, frankly expressed the essence of these sentiments:

"Talking with our businessmen, I note their desire to cooperate with the USSR. But every businessman must be certain that the money invested will not disappear. At present many entrepreneurs in the West are not certain of this. Stability is needed in the country."

It is not hard to assume that the same attitude to the prospects for Soviet-U.S. cooperation is also widespread among other social groups of Americans: so long as they do not "make a mistake," "miscalculate," "lose out...."

Did the Senate hearings provide the answers to the questions raised and dispel the doubts that exist? I believe they did to a certain degree. However, let us give the floor to the U.S. experts and analysts who addressed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In the opinion of Mayer, a Massachusetts Institute of Technology expert, the influence of the Soviet military on political decisionmaking in the USSR has become "less threatening" but more "subtle." The widespread notion in the United States that "Gorbachev shares power with the military" or "is under strong pressure from it" does not tally with reality, he says. Soviet military leaders make successful use of their professional knowledge (official information, analytical potential, etc.) to implement decisions in the sphere of national security.

Even though Gorbachev does not always agree with the military, Mayer believes, he listens attentively to their arguments because, in respect of questions of reorganizing the Armed Forces and fulfilling the arms control agreements with the United States, the leaders of the Soviet Armed Forces possess knowledge which is not at the disposal of any other department in this country. In this connection, Mayer comments, there are no grounds for believing that the Soviet military is interested in wrecking disarmament agreements. It is, rather, a question of its trying to alter their contents, particularly with regard to strategic offensive arms, in order to compensate for the changes in the military-political situation caused by the timing and methods of this reduction, as well as by the unilateral Soviet troop withdrawal from East European countries, the U.S. expert believes.

Expressing the viewpoint of his own organization, Warner, a Rand Corporation analyst, noted the growth in the number of Soviet servicemen taking a direct part in the political life of the Soviet Union. He believes, however, that there are no grounds for fearing changes in the traditional practice in the USSR of the subordination of military structures to civilian political authority. Despite the increased political activeness, Warner believes, the leadership of the USSR Armed Forces "is not a dominant force in Soviet foreign and domestic policy" and does not intend to strive for such influence.

"Equally," the Rand Corporation's spokesman concludes, "an attempt at a military coup in the USSR is hardly likely. The military will evidently continue its complex political maneuvering in defense of national interests."

It was pointed out during the hearings "On the Role of the Military in the USSR" that our country's top military leadership supports the idea of implementing "market reforms" and using force to preserve the Soviet Union's unity if individual republics wage the struggle for independence using unconstitutional methods. It supports the idea of further strengthening USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and KGB troops so as not to mobilize regular military units in corresponding situations—which would damage the Army's authority. However, if the USSR's central political leadership adopts a decision to use force to prevent the country's collapse, the Soviet Union's military leaders will unhesitatingly fulfill that order, U.S. experts believe.

Of course, it is frequently easier to display knowledge and wisdom in other people's affairs than in one's own. But the U.S. legislators' desire to analyze objectively the complexities of the present time in the USSR in itself merits a positive assessment, for deep-rooted notions and prejudices are the worst enemy of any truth.

And again: Under conditions when certain forces which are straining for power are trying to split the ranks of servicemen, to cast aspersions on the state of affairs in the Soviet Army—the defender of the homeland—and to distort its role in the processes of our society's perestroyka, a considered and generally objective view "from outside" also makes it possible to assess more accurately the similar efforts of certain home-bred "democrats."

China

Polozkov Meeting With Jiang Zemin Reported

LD2906110691 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 29 Jun 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Kashirov]

[Text] Beijing June 29 TASS—A delegation of the party functionaries of the Russian Federation Communist Party, led by Ivan Polozkov, Politburo member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and Russian Communist Party chief, ended their ten-day visit to China today with a friendly meeting with the Communist Party of China (CPC) chief, Jiang Zemin.

"Traditional friendship and goodneighbourliness between the Soviet Union and China, and between Russia and China meet the basic interests of the peoples of the two countries. Our common task is to multiply these traditions," Jiang Zemin told the delegation.

For his part, Polozkov expressed gratitude to the CPC Central Committee for the given opportunity to get acquainted with the 12-year experience of China in

pursuing a policy of reforms and foreign policy openness and in ensuring Chinese society's advance along the road of socialist modernisation. He warmly congratulated Jiang Zemin and all Chinese Communists on the CPC's 70th jubilee.

The Russian delegation, including leaders and party functionaries from Siberia and the Far East, held talks with the leadership of the International Relations Department of the CPC Central Committee, toured northeastern China, visiting the cities of Harbin, Shenyang and Dalian.

The programme of the tour was rather busy. The delegation had talks with the secretaries of the party committees of various levels, and had numerous meetings with urban and rural work collectives that work under conditions of economic and social reforms.

Chinese comrades displayed much interest in the activities of Russian Communists who actively engage in a quest for ways to take their republic out of the crisis and seek ways to establish constructive cooperation with Russia's all political forces that are ready for such cooperation.

Russian and Chinese Communists achieved mutual understanding on further development of direct contacts and exchanges between the contiguous areas of the Russian Federation and China.

Speakers during the meetings pointed out that regular contacts between local party committees could effectivley contribute to giving greater scope to the entire spectrum of cross-border cooperation between the Russian Federation and northeastern China.

During a meeting here with the staff of the Soviet Embassy and other Soviet institutions in China, Polozkov described the current economic and political situation in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation.

Reportage on Sino-Soviet Border Talks

Foreign Ministry Comments

OW0107055091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report by diplomatic correspondent Igor Porshnev: "Soviet-Sino Deal: USSR Would Gain by Border Delineation"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department for the Far East and Indochina countries, Mr.-Sergey Razov, said the Soviet-Sino agreement on demarcating the common border in its eastern [as received] helped resolve a number of controversial issues. Mr.Razov told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent that the absence of such an agreement in the past had led to a number of border disputes. The agreement was signed this May by the Soviet and Chinese foreign minister as China's communist party leader, Mr.Jiang Zemin, came on a formal visit to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, in the 1986 speech in Vladivostok suggested that fairways could be used to delineate the common border along the rivers separating the two countries which is in line with international law. Mr.Razov said that it was on this basis that the two countries had been engaged in border talks ending in the signing of an appropriate agreement.

Under agreement, all of the islands beyond the fairway and close to China are to fall under its jurisdiction. The same principle applies to islands close to the Soviet Union. As a result, said Mr.Razov, the number of islands and the size of territory falling under Soviet jurisdiction would be in excess of China's. But he gave no figures saying these would not be known until relevant work was completed by a demarcation commission to be set up under the bilateral agreement. Mr.Razov spoke of a daunting job ahead given that there are hundreds of islands on Amur, Ussuri, and other rivers.

Mr.Razov said the border agreement was the first of its kind in the history of Soviet-Sino relations. He said the common border was now given an exact legal wording which would help towards further normalisation there turning it into one of peace and neighbourly relations.

Churkin on Reports 'Twisting' Facts

OW0107012491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1400 GMT 29 Jun 91

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Dear listeners and friends, Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the Information Administration of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, made a statement at a press briefing for Soviet and foreign reporters. He said: Recently, the mass media has carried many reports twisting the facts and essence of the talks on the Soviet-Chinese border issue.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said: The agreement the Soviet Union and China reached on 16 May on the border issue in the two countries' eastern regions is based on modern international law. This law stipulates the border line [word indistinct] on the river.

Churkin emphatically said: The agreement signed by the Soviet Union and China refers only to the eastern region. Both sides, however, at this time still have failed to reach a consensus on a small part of land in Khabarovsk. Currently, both sides are holding consultations on the border issue in the western region.

Churkin continued: The agreement we have reached is the result of efforts by the Soviet Union and China. We have, in accordance with international law, found a way acceptable to both sides. Representatives of the foreign ministry of the RSFSR and other republics also attended the talks. This is quite important.

Touching on the articles in some newspapers and magazines on the question of defending some territories, Churkin said: This question is to a large extent an impetuous act and illogical. For instance, some newspapers say Zhenbao Island will be put under China's jurisdiction. Actually, however, this island has been under the control of the Soviet side all along over the past 20 years. How can one say that this island has been taken away by force from the Soviets who work and live there and handed to China? The Soviet Foreign Ministry hopes that the road will be unblocked. In addition, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR will soon approve this agreement. Many remaining questions will be fully answered.

Agreement on Use of Amur River by Chinese Ships

OW3006133791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1300 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] The Soviet Union and China have reached an agreement on transit of and shipping on the Amur River by Chinese ships. Now ships flying the Chinese flag can enter the Pacific Ocean through the lower reaches of the Amur River.

The Amur runs through the border area between China and the Soviet Union. Most of the river is in Soviet territory.

70th Anniversary of CPC Commemorated

Central Committee Sends Greetings

LD3006192491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 30 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jun (TASS)—The Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee has cordially congratulated the Central Committee and all members of the Communist Party of China on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of its founding. "We wish Communists and all citizens of the People's Republic of China new achievements in socialist construction, successful fulfilment of the large-scale programs for the country's modernization, and progress along the road of reform and renewal," says the greetings telegram from the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

"We are convinced that further strengthening of friendly and egalitarian (?relations) have a positive influence on shaping the situation in the world. Soviet Communists intend to continue to make their own weighty contribution to increasing potential for good-neighborliness, friendship, and cooperation between the peoples of our countries."

CPC Development Viewed

PM0107090191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 First Edition p 7

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Ye. Bazhanov: "A Long and Difficult Path Has Been Traveled. The CPC Is 70 Years Old"]

The establishment of the Communist Party of China [CPC] was announced in Shanghai 1 July 1921. People in the PRC note that it was born "under the influence of the October Revolution in Russia and with the assistance of the Communist International headed by Lenin." The event passed almost unnoticed at the time—the new party had only a few dozen members, and the overwhelming majority of Chinese did not know about its existence. Nonetheless, very soon the CPC made its presence felt, entering the country's political stage and proceeding to exert a decisive influence on the fate of the Chinese nation, which it continues to do to this day. On the day ofC??z?? the leadership of the CPC the Chinese people embarked on a long and difficult struggle to transform society. The aim set the working people by the Communists was to remove "the three big mountains"—imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capital—from the Chinese people and create a new China. This objective won the CPC prestige in the twenties and thirties.

During the period of struggle against Japanese aggression (1937-1945) the CPC managed to put down deep roots among the Chinese people and subsequently mobilize them for the rout of the corrupt pro-Western Chiang Kai-shek regime during the civil war (1945-1949). In 1949 the Communists took all power in the country into their own hands. They were filled with optimism and bright hopes. True, the revolution in China met with a hostile reception from the United States and its partners, but it had the Soviet Union on its side.

In a short time the PRC achieved tangible successes in socioeconomic development. However, very soon it became obvious that the system which had been created following the example and the image of the Soviet model was by no means ideal. First of all, flaws in the political structure made themselves felt. All the power was concentrated in the hands of a narrow circle of people. Disregarding the objective potential and interests of society, in 1958 they proclaimed the course of the "three red banners" aimed at "speeding up the building of socialism and making an immediate transition to communism." The actual idea of an accelerated buildup of industrial capacities and the unification of agricultural workers by administrative command methods was borrowed by the Chinese comrades from us. However, while copying foreign experience, the PRC leaders decided to make a contribution of their own to the theory and practice of socialist building. They set the aim of doing everything better and faster than in the USSR. As a consequence an extreme bias toward the left built up.

The negative results of this policy soon began to manifest themselves. In addition to domestic problems, difficulties arose in the foreign policy sphere. By the end of the fifties the alliance with the Soviet Union, which had until then seemed indestructible, began to show cracks. Ideological and other differences arose between the Soviet and the Chinese leadership. China set a course toward confrontation with both camps—Soviet and American—and toward "exporting revolution" to the third world. But the more the Chinese leadership veered

to the left, the worse it fared. Extremist views of socialism, and the striving to suppress mounting dissatisfaction prompted Beijing to unleash the "cultural revolution" in 1966 which lasted 10 years.

The turning point in the history of the CPC was the Third Plenary Session of the 11th CPC Central Committee, which was held in December 1978. A line whose essence lay in, first, concentrating the party's efforts on the economic front and the modernization of the country, and second, elaborating a realistic program of building socialism, won the day. The economic policy of the late fifties was later evaluated as "left deviationist errors," and the "Cultural Revolution" as "the dictatorship of the blackest utterly rotten fascism with an admixture of feudalism."

The new leadership set the task of debunking the dogmatic interpretation of Marxism and of the erroneous views presented as this teaching. It was stressed that Marxism does not contain "anything sacred or inviolable that cannot be changed or taken out altogether; the only criterion of truth is practical experience." Anything that did not favor the development of production forces was characterized as conflicting with scientific socialism and thus impermissible. The conclusion was reached in Beijing that the new society could only be built on the basis of material needs and benefits, disregarding which "is idealism." Encouragement of the swiftest possible enhancement of people's prosperity through their own labor became the "fundamental principle and main stance of the CPC." It was also realized that it was necessary to expand in every way cooperation with the outside world ("open policy"). Profound reforms were initiated in the country which enabled China to take a big step toward progress.

At the same time, toward the end of the eighties very serious problems came to light in the national economy—the harvest stopped keeping pace with the population growth, dangerous "overheating" arose in industry, and inflation spiraled. Corruption among party and economic officials reached an unprecedented scale. Material stratification and confrontation between the poor and the rich, especially in the countryside, intensified sharply. Ideological ferment was rising in society. Some people rejected the reforms as being at variance with Marxism-Leninism, leading to the demise of socialism and the transformation of China into a vassal of foreign exploiters, while others, on the contrary, urged stepping up the pace of transformations and ending corruption by means of broad democratization of the political system. Voices were also heard favoring the renunciation of socialist ideals and the country's switch to a Western mode of development.

The flammable material which had accumulated in society, including in its leading circles, ultimately led to an explosion. In the spring of 1989 a wave of young people's demonstrations hit the country and then spilled into unrest described by the authorities as a "counterrevolutionary mutiny." It was put down by the army. Following this, Zhao Ziyang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, was removed from the leading organs, and arrests took place.

The attitude toward class struggle was adjusted. As Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, pointed out, it "will exist within specific bounds for a long time and could even grow exacerbated." Propaganda of Marxism-Leninism and of Mao Zedong thought was stepped up. Everything possible is being done to strengthen the leading role of the Communist Party as laid down in the Constitution. Without denying the importance of political reforms, people in Beijing state the need for a "precise distinction" between socialist and capitalist democracy, the impermissibility of "unchecked democratization," and "attacks on the socialist system under the guise of democratic slogans." The idea that Chinese democracy should be implemented "under the centralized leadership of the CPC" is propagandized. Any attempt to create factions, groups, or platforms within the party are condemned.

The CPC leadership's political line has given rise to objections both from the Chinese intelligentsia and from certain foreign quarters. However, Beijing has very weighty arguments. People in the Chinese capital are convinced that, had the authorities made concessions in June 1989, the country would have been mired in chaos and unrest, without any real prospect of surmounting the situation and creating a genuinely democratic model of society.

China has more than 800 million peasants, 200 million illiterates, and 100 million people living below the poverty line. It is a vast ocean of prejudices, unsatisfied ambitions, and nursed grievances. It contains clannish, group-minded, and parochial people. The PRC has been through an orgy of untrammeled instincts and emotions once already—during the "Cultural Revolution." Its wounds have still not finally healed. And it is very important, it is being emphasized in Beijing, that there is no bloodshed in China today, people are not excessively embittered, and the conditions for economic development have been preserved.

Following the June events of 1989 the CPC leadership's efforts in the national economic sphere were focused on settling the problems that had built up. In 1990 inflation was cut from 17.8 to 2.1 percent. Economic growth rates fell to a sensible level, and the economy became more balanced. Last year GNP rose by 5 percent and a record grain harvest of 435 million tonnes was recorded. Urban incomes rose 8.6 percent, and commodity exports increased by 18.1 percent. At the same time, unemployment increased, and one-third of state enterprises continue to make a loss. Because of the population's low buying power and the low quality of output a considerable surplus supply of goods emerged.

How does Beijing plan to overcome these difficulties? It is clear from CPC documents that priority is being given to public ownership of the means of production and to

the plan. Other forms of ownership and market regulation are given an auxiliary role. The proposed blend of two types of economy is described as a socialist planned commodity economy. It should be borne in mind, however, that the Chinese are not rejecting the major steps toward the market which they started taking in 1979. Contracts are being introduced into state enterprises, and leasing and shareholding systems are being experimented with. It has been recommended from above that the temporary strict limitations on the activity of the collective and private sectors be removed, and that family contracts in the countryside should not be wound up. Total planning is rejected as being something that stifles the economy. On the basis of these and other measures China is planning to double its GNP by the year 2000 and to raise the population's living standard to average levels.

The year 1989 affected the PRC's foreign policy. There was a break in Beijing's relations with the West. On the one hand, the CPC leadership had an acute feeling that the United States and its allies were the source of a major ideological threat. The West, for its part, brought in political and economic sanctions against "undemocratic" China.

This year was a watershed in Soviet-Chinese relations. During M.S. Gorbachev's historic visit to the PRC in May 1989 relations were normalized and cooperation between the two great neighbors and major communist parties started gaining momentum.

At the same time, Beijing was following the evolution of the situation in our country and Moscow's policy in East Europe with increasing alarm. The negative reaction to pluralism and new thinking was compounded by fears that these risky experiments would "infiltrate" China across the Great Wall. Certain people in the PRC capital called for the renewal of ideological battles with the new generation of "revisionists."

But reason prevailed. The PRC's top leadership reminded the "militants" what the "cold war" with the USSR had cost the Chinese people. Another round of tilting at the windmills of revisionism would be even more costly. Beijing made its position clear: The 1989 accords remain in force, each side being completely entitled to go its own way.

By the summer of 1990 the neutral Chinese approach to our affairs had changed into a desire to help the center headed by M. Gorbachev.

The May visit to our country by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, convincingly reaffirmed that Soviet-Chinese cooperation is being deepened in all areas. The rapprochement between Moscow and Beijing is so tangible that certain hotheads have even started talking about a revival of the alliance between the two socialist powers. However, neither the Soviet nor the Chinese side is striving for this. For more than a decade now the PRC has been implementing a policy of cooperation with everyone, irrespective of their partners' philosophy. China's modernization plans are based on this strategy. Beijing is making the utmost effort to bring new life to contacts with the United States and its friends.

Admittedly, the Chinese are worried that the Americans' heads may be turned by their unchecked omnipotence—particularly after the "easy war" in the Gulf. But China's aim remains unchanged—to maintain the balance of forces in the world arena.

It seems that Moscow and Beijing are now keeping Soviet-Chinese collaboration within an optimal framework.

Thus, the CPC has reached its 70th anniversary. A long, hard, contradictory road lies behind it. Mistakes—considerable mistakes—have been made and have sometimes affected the Chinese people's interests. But it is necessary to see the main thing, which is that the Communist Party put an end to the old China's downtrodden, semicolonial condition, eliminated terrible poverty and blatant social inequality, put the country on the path of progressive economic development, and raised the PRC to the status of a great power which has things to teach others, including us.

Veterans Official Evaluates Recent PRC Visit

OW2906081791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1300 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] A Soviet veterans delegation visited China not long ago. Our station reporter interviewed Comrade (Hulik), a member of the delegation and also member of [words indistinct] of the All- Union Veterans Organization, and asked him to tell our listeners his impressions of the trip.

Comrade (Hulik) pointed out: This visit to our friends' country has been unforgettable. We had the opportunity to familiarize ourselves with the lives and work of Chinese people. Their [words indistinct] and effective work have had a deep impression on us. To our knowledge, in China today, [words indistinct] truly applied their talents, abilities, strengths, and knowledge in state, collective, and private enterprises. We believe that this clearly proves the correctness of the principle laid down since the Third Plenary Session of the 11th CPC Central Committee held in December 1978. Implementing this principle, the country has made great achievements.

Comrade (Hulik) said: The situation in China proves the correctness of the road taken by China. We have understood that in last 10 years, the number of college students in China increased by 130 percent. Since liberation, the children's death rate has dropped nearly 80 percent. Average life spans went from 35 to 69 years. We believe that these achievements are due to the CPC's contributions; they were made by the people under CPC guidance.

Comrade (Hulik) pointed out: During the visit to various localities in China, the Soviet veterans delegation saw [passage indistinct]. Of course, China has not yet solved all its problems. During their conversation with us, the Chinese friends did not conceal the major difficulties in their country, but those difficulties are basically the difficulties accompanying development. In our view, what is important is that the CPC is persistently trying to solve all the problems and find the best way to fulfill the [word indistinct] plan. Another very important thing is that the people support the party's principles and policies, believe the party, and accept its leadership.

Comrade (Hulik) said: The 70th anniversary of the founding of the CPC falls on 1 July this year. In these years, it has travelled an arduous and yet glorious road. From a small group studying Marxism, it has become a political party leading a country with the largest population in the world.

The Soviet veterans pointed out with particular satisfaction that the CPC has pursued, since its founding, a line of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. During their conversation with Chinese friends, the Soviet veterans gratefully discussed [words indistinct] cooperation.

In conclusion, Comrade (Hulik), a member of the Soviet veterans delegation that visited China recently, told our reporter: Recently, the Soviet people have extended their congratulations and best wishes to their Chinese friends on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the founding of the CPC.

Northeast Asia

LDP Parliamentary Group Visits Khabarovsk

OW2906082391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1100 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Excerpts] On 27 June, an LDP parliamentary delegation stopped over in Khabarovsk City on its way from Moscow to Japan. The delegation toured the city, some factories, and the Khabarovsk museum. The delegation also met with the first secretary of the Khabarovsk Kray Party Committee and members of the Khabarovsk Kray Assembly.

What follows are some of the major points of remarks, recorded by a Radio Moscow Far Eastern affairs reporter, made at the meeting.

Speaking at the meeting, Makarov, first secretary of the Khabarovsk Kray Party Committee, said:

[Begin Makarov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] I am very pleased to meet members of the LDP parliamentary delegation here in Khabarovsk. Before exchanging views with you, I would like to briefly explain the organization of the Communist Party in the Khabarovsk Kray.

Today, the party has 70,000 members; there are party committees at the town and district level. About 2,000 party apparatuses have been founded in major enterprises to conduct party activities. The Soviet Union is now setting up a multiparty system. The Socialist Democratic Party, the Democratic Party, and the Farmers Party, in addition to the Communist Party, have chapters in the kray. The Social Political Activity Group and the Democratic Russia Front also have chapters in the kray. Various other social groups maintain their chapters here.

The Khabarovsk Kray Party Committee has thus far maintained good relationships with the CPC, the Workers Party of Korea, and the Social Democratic Party of Japan. I am pleased to meet members of the LDP parliamentary delegation. I am convinced that President Gorbachev's recent visit to Japan and his talks with representatives of Japanese political parties will promote exchanges between political parties in Japan and the Soviet Union, deepening understanding between people in the two countries. [end recording]

In response, Keijiro Murata, on behalf of the LDP parliamentary delegation, said:

[Begin Murata recording] The first secretary greeted us at the airport and asked us to participate in this meeting. I would like to expresses my heartfelt appreciation to the first secretary. My name is Keijiro Murata; I am president of the LDP Dietmen's League for Japan-USSR Relations. Names of delegation members at this meeting are written on name cards on the table; I invite you to look at these name cards.

The LDP is the leading political party in Japan; the LDP president is the prime minister. [words indistinct]

President Gorbachev and his wife visited Japan from 16 to 19 April for the first time. During his stay in Japan, the president met with representative of the Diet and business circles. President Gorbachev's speeches drew great attention in Japan.

Our delegation is visiting the Soviet Union in the wake of President Gorbachev's visit to Japan. We have found that all Soviets are doing their utmost to build friendly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. We were in Moscow four days. We met with President Gorbachev, Vice President Yanayev, and other Soviet officials. I think that those meetings with the Soviet leaders were very fruitful. You have all read about our meetings with Soviet leaders in the newspapers and seen reports on the television news. I believe that we had very fruitful and wonderful meetings with Soviet leaders.

Before leaving for Moscow, I met with Prime Minister Kaifu, former Prime Minister Takeshita, and former Prime Minister Fukuda [words indistinct].

I am very pleased to visit this city; it is a trip for which I have long hoped.

I believe that President Gorbachev's visit to Japan has paved the way for opening a friendly era in Japan-USSR relations. [end recording]

At the meeting, Nikolay Danilov, member of the Congress of People's Deputies and chairman of the Khabarovsk Kray Assembly, emphasized his high regard for results of friendly exchanges between Japanese and Soviet parliamentarians and for the expanded relationship between local communities in the two countries. He went on to say:

[Begin Danilov recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] Lately, enterprises in both Japan and the Soviet Union have been concerned about economic cooperation between the two countries. We have reason to believe that both the Soviet Union and Japan are very interested in each other. Many projects await joint implementation. I believe that the slow pace of economic cooperation between the two countries stems from the fact that we have come to know each other only recently. We sincerely hope that the Japanese Government will not continue to link its policy of expanding economic exchanges between the two countries to the territories issue, as it has done in the past.

The development of the Soviet Far East depends now more than ever on the participation of foreign enterprises. Many foreign enterprises have made various business offers. It would be very regrettable if Japanese enterprises fall behind other foreign enterprises in participating in the development of the Soviet Far East, as Japanese enterprises have thus far been our only partners. We have just begun exchanges with enterprises in the ROK, Taiwan, the United States, and Singapore. I believe that it will be awhile before we can develop fruitful exchanges with them.

As representatives of state organizations in the kray, we intend to cooperate fully in creating favorable conditions and preferential treatment for Japanese enterprises that participate in the economic development of the Khabarovsk Kray.

An unprecedented exhibition will be held in Khabarovsk City beginning 20 July. About 40 Japanese firms will participate in the exhibition. From the Soviet side, all oblasts and krays in the Soviet Far East and Siberia will participate. We intend to establish working contacts with Japanese enterprises at the exhibition. We expect that Japanese enterprises will examine the possibility of participating in the economic development of the Soviet Far East and Siberia. [end recording]

Meanwhile, Shin Sakurai, deputy chief of the LDP parliamentary delegation, said:

[Begin Sakurai recording] The almost 50 years since the end of World War Two have been a sad period between Japan and the Soviet Union. At long last, however, the two countries have begun to open a new era and to build good-neighbor relations. I believe that Japanese enterprises might not participate in the economic development of the Soviet Far East in the ways in which you expect; it is necessary to give them a little more time [words indistinct].

Japanese living along the Sea of Japan feel close to the Maritime Kray and Siberia.

As you are aware, there is a Dietmen's League for Japan-USSR Relations, headed by House of Representatives Speaker Sakurauchi. The league is a supraparty group organized by parliamentarians from the LDP, the Communist Party of Japan, and other political parties.

The late Shintaro Abe visited Moscow last January to promote friendly and good-neighbor relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. Upon his return home, he said: The Soviets have great interest in Japan. After studying Japan from various angles, the Soviets have realized that will get nowhere with Japan if they only maintain relationships with the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party; they have concluded that they need to maintain a relationship with the LDP in order to do business with Japan.

I was asked last April to head a group of LDP politicians interested in promoting relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. Shortly thereafter, I consulted with Shintaro Abe about this request. Abe, after conferring with Speaker Sakurauchi, decided to create a Dietmen's League for Japan-USSR Relations, comprised only of LDP parliamentarians. Abe named Murata president of the league. Murata has served as minister of international trade and industry and chairman of the LDP Policy Affairs Research Council. Members of the league, particularly Murata, prepared a welcome party for President Gorbachev.

Although President Gorbachev's recent visit to Japan might have failed to produce the results you expected, it might be a little hard for the two countries to open their doors to each other because of almost 50 years of sad history. The issues of the Northern Territories and the detention of Japanese soldiers in Siberia shortly after the end of World War Two are unforgettable and symbolic for the Japanese. It will take a long time for the Japanese to fully understand these things. I think that the Soviets should take actions to win the understanding of the Japanese in these matters.

In the meantime, we intend to do something in support of President Gorbachev, who is vigorously promoting perestroyka and trying to brake 70 years of rule by the Communist Party. We are visiting the Soviet Union to see what we can do for the president. [end recording] [passage omitted]

The LDP parliamentary delegation left today for Japan after visiting the graves of Japanese soldiers in Khabarovsk Kray.

Japanese Official Says Survey Team Plans Visit

OW2906045391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1400 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] According to a TASS report from Tokyo, Eiichi Nakao, minister of International Trade and Industry [MITI], said on the evening of 27 June that the Japanese Government had decided to dispatch group of experts to the Soviet Union to study the possibility of Japan's technological assistance for Soviet efforts to convert the munitions industry into a civilian industry.

MITI Minister Nakao stressed that Japan's intellectual and technological assistance in the field would greatly contribute to the Soviet program for introducing a market economy system.

The experts' group is expected to arrive in Moscow on 16 July. Members of the Japanese survey group include economists, MITI officials, and private-sector experts working with major automobile and electric applicance manufacturers. In addition, two U.S. officials from the State Department and the Defense Department will join the group by request from the Japanese.

The survey group will visit some munitions plants in the Ural region to study the actual conditions for fostering civilian industries in the Soviet Union. At the end of the tour, the group and Soviet officials will hold a joint symposium to discuss tangible measures for bilateral cooperation. Moreover, the Japanese side plans to explain to Soviet experts how Japan has succeeded in converting the munitions industry into a civilian industry after World War II.

Mitsubishi Branch Office Opens in Siberia

OW2806142591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1100 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] A branch office of the Mitsubishi Corporation, a company engaged in worldwide activities in trade and other services, opened in the city of Khabarovsk. As you all know, this company has 230 branch offices in more than 80 countries all over the world. Mitsubishi's Tanaka gave the following remarks during the opening ceremony:

[Begin Tanaka recording] Respected Vice Chairman (Tsvetkov) of the local Soviet, respected guests: I am Tanaka of Mitsubishi Corporation. Thank you very much for taking time out from your busy schedules to attend this ceremony today. The first branch manager, Ito, arrived in Khabarovsk last December. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce him once more and to extend my greetings.

It has been 26 years since the Mitsubishi Corporation started business transactions with your country. Over that period, Soviet-Japanese trade has increased 10 times to about $6 billion. Thanks to your help, the Mitsubishi Corporation's business volume last year amounted to $800 million, which was no. 1 among Japanese trading firms. This was possible because of the relationship of trust established through long years of efforts on both sides. I believe that our responsibility in Japan-Soviet economic relations is becoming even greater.

Our business transactions in the Soviet Far East began in the same year trading with the USSR began. Our operations in the Far East, including import of lumber and export of machinery for the development of forestry resources, have a long history. We have also established a cooperative relationship in wide ranging areas, such as shipping, energy, and fisheries. On the other hand, the Soviet Union is now in a period of economic transformation characterized by the delegation of economic powers to the localities and liberalization. The Soviet Far East, with its bountiful resources, is in particular expected to play an important role. The opening of a Mitsubishi branch office in Khabarovsk has been a long cherished dream of ours, and is regarded as indispensable in promoting even closer cooperation with the Soviet Far East. I am very pleased to announce to you today the opening of the Mitsubishi Khabarovsk Branch Office. Thanks to your help, we are able to start operations smoothly in your country. The company staff led by Manager Ito deeply appreciate your valuable cooperation, including the assistance provided by the kray and city authorities, and the Khabarovsk Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Business transactions between Japan and the Far East have been changing both in content and form; it is undergoing a diversifation process. Business relations have become more complicated and more international in character, expanding from simple bilateral import and export trade to include large-scale projects, joint ventures, trilateral and multimodal transactions, and industrial cooperation.

Today, aside from people from our main office and Moscow office, managers from our branch offices in Hokkaido, Niigata, and Toyama are also present here. We believe that exchanges between regional cities will become more active in the future. Furthermore, in accordance with the wishes of the economic circles in the Far East, there is great potential for further development of economic relations between the Soviet Far East and Japan. The Mitsubishi Corporation intends to do its best to develop transactions and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. The company staff led by Manager Ito wish to request your continued assistance and cooperation in the future. [end recording]

Mr. Tanaka gave the above remarks.

This is what Mr. Tanaka said: Mitsubishi Corporation holds the number one position in the field of trade with the Soviet Union. However, Vice Chairman (Tsvetkov) said that the fact that this company had opened up a branch office in Khabarovsk tells us that Soviet-Japanese relations are warming up. He then continued to say as follows:

[Begin Tsvetkov recording in Russian which gradually fades into Japanese translation] Today, we are witnessing an important event in our lives in Khabarosk Oblast and the Soviet Far East region; that is the establishment of the Mitsubishi Corporation's branch office. The inauguration of this branch office proves the fact that Japanese financiers want to take part in the projects which are currently being promoted in the Soviet Union. In the Khabarovsk region, Mitsubishi Corporation is well known for civil engineering machines, wood processing equipment, and many other goods. However, we hope the company, in addition to trade, will start making investment for the development of industries and infrastructure in this region. As you already know, Khabarovsk Oblast is blessed with natural resources, including lumber, and biological and mineral resources. In other words, there are fields in which investment can be made. The Soviet Far East region established additional preferential conditions in order to enable foreign industries to provide us with cooperation. The government of the RSFSR explained a plan designed to turn the entire Soviet Far East region into a district in which free enterprise activities can be practiced. Regarding Khabarovsk City's administrative organs of the Khabarovsk Oblast, we can guarantee that we will exert efforts to create circumstances in which Mitsubishi Corporation, not only in its relations with the entire Soviet Union, will also be able to hold the number one position in its relations with Khabarovsk Oblast as well. [end recording]

This is what Vice Chairman (Tsvetkov) said.

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan Reportedly To Buy Weapons From PRC

BK3006113191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Urdu 1200 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Commentary by Vasant Georgiyev]

[Text] The Indian press has carried a distressing report published by the UNITED NEWS OF INDIA that Pakistan is going to buy M-11 missiles from the PRC. Our commentator Vasant Georgiyev writes in this connection.

Of late, the international press has been focussing considerable attention on the possible sale of short-range ballistic missiles by PRC to Pakistan and some countries in the Middle East.

This question is primarily linked to the most delicate issue of nuclear nonproliferation. Obviously, it is due to the fact that these Chinese M-11 missiles are capable of carrying not only conventional but nuclear bombs as well up to a distance of 300 km. It is not a secret that certain quarters in Pakistan have been aspiring to own nuclear weapons for quite some time. Several papers have reported that Pakistan even now has six to eight nuclear bombs. Moreover, these press reports have never borne any testimony to the peaceful nature of Pakistan's nuclear program.

In view of this, the Washington administration had decided to suspend its annual military and economic aid package to Islamabad since last October. As a matter of fact, since Pakistan will have rockets and nuclear arms, its neighboring countries would also like to possess similar weapons. That means the arms race in all of South Asia will assume new proportions. This time, it will be a nuclear arms race. But statements from the leaders of Pakistan, India, and other countries indicate that they totally dislike that prospect. Therefore Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's recent initiative is noteworthy. He proposed the convening of an international conference to consider the question of making South Asia a nuclear free zone. In fact, Nawaz Sharif's proposal calls for a meeting of representatives from five countries—the Soviet Union, PRC, U.S., India, and Pakistan.

It should be noted that PRC has expressed its willingness to cooperate with other countries on the ratification of arms sales to the Middle East and certain countries. Recently, the Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman in Beijing confirmed that his country will participate in the conference organized to dicuss this issue in Paris next month. The PRC's measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and their carriers are quite significant.

It is to be noted that two contradictory trends are existing in this region. It will be known within a few days which one will eventually prevail.

Commentary on Skirmishes in Kashmir

BK2806145191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Hindi 1300 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Commentary by Vasant Georgiyev]

[Text] There was a heavy exchange of fire for 6 hours between Indian and Pakistani border security forces on the Line of Control in Kashmir on 25 June, in which some people were killed. Our correspondent Vasant Georgiyev writes:

Apparently, this escalation in tension on the Line of Control can be dismissed as a normal occurrence, because the two sides have traded fire time and again and have moved troops to intimidate each other in the long history of the Kashmir dispute. But this new escalation in tension is a cause of concern, because this is the first armed conflict on the Line of Control in Kashmir after the assumption of power by the new government in New Delhi. It is worth noting that in his television address to the nation, Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao had spoken in favor of developing good- neighborly relations with all neighboring countries. Surprisingly, this escalation in tension came close on the heels of the second round of talks that Narasimha Rao has been having with Kashmir Governor Girish Chandra Saxena

for normalizing the situation in Kashmir. Against this background, some observers link the exchange of fire on the line of control with the efforts of certain elements to thwart the normalization of the situation in Kashmir. These elements are active both in India and Pakistan. In India, these forces pursue nationalistic and communal policies, while in Pakistan, they are guided by military circles. They think that in this atmosphere of heightened tension between India and Pakistan, they will be able to make Washington realize the need for the resumption of military aid to Pakistan. There is no doubt that the policy of escalating tension between two neighboring states—no matter who follows this policy—will ultimately fail. But, the exchange of fire that was provoked in Kashmir will definitely deal a serious blow to the search for ways and means to resolve the Kashmir dispute and consequently to the process of establishing good-neighborly relations between India and Pakistan.

Nishanov Meets With Sri Lankan Delegation

LD2706080991 Moscow TASS in English 2009 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet Parliament's Council of Nationalities, today met a delegation of the Parliament of Sri Lanka. The delegation, led by Parliament Speaker M.H. Mohamed, is currently in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

Nishanov informed the guests about the course of radical transformations involving all aspects of the life of Soviet society, work on the finalisation of a new Union treaty and basic orientations for the Soviet Parliament's activities at the present stage.

Matters aimed at further developing contacts between the two parliaments and at drawing them into the Soviet Union's and Sri Lanka's cooperation in the international arena, primarily in the interests of ensuring security and stability in the Indian Ocean area and in South Asia, were discussed during the meeting.

The two sides emphasised that parliamentary contacts play an important role in stimulating a mutually beneficial political dialogue and contribute to business cooperation between the two countries.

'Pressure' on Jordan on Palestinian Issue Seen

PM2806103591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by An. Stepanov: "Government Headed by Palestinian"]

[Excerpts] Beirut, 25 Jun—The first sitting of Prime Minister Tahir al-Masri's new government has been held in Amman. Its head stated his commitment to King Husayn's course of strengthening democracy and the multiparty system in the country. [passage omitted]

Jordan voiced its readiness to take part in a peace conference within the framework of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation if the Palestinians themselves agree to that idea.

It is typical that Jordan is now coming under strong pressure from certain U.S. circles to enter into bilateral talks with Israel and include in its delegation representatives of the Palestinians whom the Israeli authorities have approved in advance. The U.S. House of Representatives recently froze $27 million of military aid to Jordan out of a package totaling almost $60 billion in overall aid to strengthen the kingdom's security. Admittedly, the U.S. Government sharply opposed this resolution. But Amman's "pro-Saddam" swing during the war with Iraq still overshadows the country's relations with the West.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Soviet Union-South Africa Society Created

PM2806141791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4

["Own Information" report: "'Soviet Union-South Africa' Society Created"]

[Text] The "Soviet Union-South Africa" society was created 26 June in Moscow at a meeting of representatives of scientific, cultural, and business circles and public organizations. The charter which was adopted stresses that the new society will promote the development of mutual understanding, trust, and all-around cooperation between the two countries in the interests of peace, democracy, and racial and national harmony. The society will operate in accordance with the position of the world community expressed in UN documents.

The participants in the meeting voiced the hope that their initiative to develop business and humanitarian ties between the peoples of the Soviet Union and South Africa will find support among the public and peoples of the two countries seeking mutual communication and the development of mutually advantageous cooperation. It is planned that the society will promote the development of human contacts and the establishment of relations of partnership, take part in Soviet-South African events, promote the mutual study of the languages of the Soviet Union and South Africa, and so forth.

Academic on Association

MB2806182791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Afrikaans 1700 GMT 27 jun 91

[Report on the Establishment of USSR-RSA Association—read by announcer]

[Excerpts] The true meaning of an event will only be determined with the passing of time. Here there are no exceptions and for this reason it will only be evident over

a few years whether Professor (Appolon Davidson) was right when he termed the USSR-RSA Association a historic event.

However, for Professor (Davidson) who has been studying South African issues for more than 40 years, and for many others who have come together at one of the lecture rooms at the University of Moscow, this event is of great importance. The dreams have become reality. This is what Professor (Davidson) had to say:

I do not like words filled with pathos but today's event is indeed historic, Professor Davidson said. The idea of establishing such an association has already been in the pipeline for a long time. Why is this idea only being implemented now? Changes are taking place in South Africa. This does not mean that sanctions have been lifted but we hope that it will take place in the near future and that apartheid will disappear rapidly. For this reason we believe that our association, the USSR-RSA Association can be established today.

Our chief aim is to encourage mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and South Africa and to encourage contacts. One has to be honest and admit that at the moment there is no mutual understanding. Where must this mutual understanding come from if our countries do not have any contact with each other? The South Africans do not have any normal, objective information about us and we do not have any such information about them. This association can bridge this divide by exchanging correct information and by assisting the nations of our two countries to learn more about one another. [Passage omitted]

(Davidson) wants to establish contacts with any social organizations and with any social forces in South Africa on condition that they are not racist, whether they are white or black organizations. We can arrange meetings with cultural workers, businessmen and politicians. It is necessary to arrange exhibitions. The association can play a very important consul?ative role. He envisages the establishment of a few commissions in the following areas: culture, history, ecology, media, and business.

Ministry Welcomes Pretoria's Nuclear Decision

MB2806175491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Afrikaans 1700 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] The Soviet Department of Foreign Affairs has issued a statement following the decision by the South African Government to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

The statement expressed the hope that South Africa's membership of the treaty will be completed without any further delay. The statement says Moscow views the South African Government's decision as an expression of political realism.

Commentary Views Latest Developments in RSA

MB2906131091 Moscow Radio Moscow in Afrikaans 1700 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Commentary by Aleksandr Fedorov—read by announcer]

[Text] The South African State President Mr. F.W. de Klerk signed 45 draft laws on Thursday [27 June] which will bring an end to earlier acts on racial discrimination.

The decision to lift the last pillars of apartheid was taken earlier during a session of the South African Parliament and was passed by the majority. Aleksandr Fedorov comments:

The scrapping of the acts by President De Klerk has put an end to the existence of the most disgraceful issue in our civilized era. One can say that the struggle of the black population, and those whites in South Africa who supported them, have been crowned with success. The system of separate development only brought South Africans pain and suffering and left victims both in the country and abroad. Political Scientist (Herman Guilomae) says it has also brought them the feeling that their country was the most rejected in the world.

One can say clearly today that the predictions of the fathers of apartheid, Verwoerd and Vorster, as well as their present supporters, that the lifting of even one or two minor apartheid acts will lead to a tragedy for the white community, has not become reality. The South African community understands the government's moves to scrap apartheid and often reacts by urging the government to speed up the process. The reaction to Parliament's, and the president's latest steps has not been too emotional but it is clear that apartheid is not yet a thing of the past.

Even though the disgraceful Population Registration Act has been lifted the former system of race classification is still in force. The Group Areas Act and the Land Acts do not exist but the state does not want to take any steps towards a speedy, redistribution of land of which 87 percent, according to this act, is reserved for development by whites; just as they do not plan to take any steps to assist in relocating blacks wherever they choose to be.

The differences between words and deeds will continue to exist until the effects of apartheid have been removed by a new constitution. It is for this reason that the opponents of the system of separate development insist on the immediate continuation of dialogue so that a new constitution can be drawn up. A complicated and dramatic period awaits this period of transition because the opponents of negotiations realize that they are standing with their backs to the wall. The liberation organizations realize that under these circumstances it is important to overcome faults and to leave their political ambitions behind so that there will be no desire to return to the old order.

President De Klerk's government is also facing a difficult task. All the steps they are presently taking are merely a

preparatory process before the new constitution can be tabled. The government realizes that it has to bring forward new initiatives with every phase. In this regard it is noteworthy that South Africa, over and above finding solutions to internal problems, is demonstrating its goodwill in the international arena. According to a statement by the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs Pik Botha the government has decided to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. The minister emphasized that South Africa has never experimented with nuclear weapons. It is good that no other place on this earth will ever experience such an explosion again.

May the world rather hear good news from South Africa on the peaceful breakdown of apartheid's remains.

Ignatenko: 'Looking Forward' to Mandela Visit

OW2806135591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 27 Jun 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report by diplomatic correspondent I. Porshnev: "Nelson Mandela Is Eagerly Expected in the Soviet Union—Vitaly Ignatenko"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "We are looking forward to a visit by Nelson Mandela to the Soviet Union", said USSR presidential aide for press service Vitaliy Ignatenko. He stressed in a talk with our DP [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent that the Soviet position remains unchanged towards the African National Congress led by, among others, Nelson Mandela. The talk was prompted by the question of USSR Deputy Sayitniaz Atayev to President Gorbachev concerning another delay of N. Mandela's visit. V. Ignatenko explained the fact by the president's excessive load of work, particularly on the new Union Treaty. He confirmed that M. Gorbachev had sent a letter to N. Mandela "notifying him of reasons for the delay". Ignatenko also expressed confidence that the visit will eventually take place. He named late summer-early autumn as a possible date.

Ambassador to Mozambique Replaced

PM2606150791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Chronicle"]

[Text] The USSR president has appointed Vladimir Vladimirovich Korneyev USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Mozambique.

The USSR president has released Nikolay Kirillovich Dybenko from his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Mozambique in connection with his retirement on pension.

The USSR president has released Vladimir Vladimirovich Korneyev from his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Somali Democratic Republic.

East Europe

Reportage on Crisis in SFRY

Foreign Ministry Issues Statement

LD2806171591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1628 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun (TASS)—A USSR Foreign Ministry statement has been distributed here today. It reads:

Following the proclamation by the parliaments of Slovenia and Croatia on the independence of these republics, the situation in Yugoslavia has sharply worsened. Clashes have taken place, military force has been used, people have been killed and wounded, and considerable material damage has been caused. At present, an order has been issued by the SFRY Government to stop the use of armed forces.

The dramatic developments in the SFRY causes serious concern. The existence of a single, independent Yugoslavia is an important element for stability in the Balkans and in Europe as a whole. Aid and support for the Yugoslav people in this difficult moment of their history is imperative for any constructive European and international policy. The sympathy and solidarity of the Soviet Union is on the side of friendly Yugoslavia.

The Soviet sides welcomes the decisions of the SFRY Federal Executive Council, calling on the political forces in the country to declare a three-month moratorium on all decisions adopted, whether they concern secession, disunification, or the changing of the structure [rezhima] of the external and internal borders. This should be done in order to find democratic and mutually agreed upon settlements to overcoming the crisis. The path to normalizing the situation lies unconditionally within peaceful dialogue and steps toward reconciliation.

The events taking place in Yugoslavia profoundly worry the international community, especially Europe. Regarding Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union comes out firmly in favor of strict adherence to all norms and principles of international law and CSCE documents. Any international efforts on an individual or collective basis should now be subordinated to the objective of ensuring, in cooperation with the SFRY Government, the necessary conditions to maintain the safety and independence of Yugoslavia, and to help the peoples of the SFRY ensure their state's safe future by democratic and peaceful means.

Pavlov Condemns Use of Force

AU2806113091 Vienna Oesterreich Eins Radio Network in German 1000 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Statement by Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov in Vienna on 28 June—recorded; in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [News announcer] Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov has in Vienna since yesterday for a three-day official visit. During a talk with Chancellor Vranitzky today he condemned Belgrade's attitude:

[Begin Pavlov recording] I would like to tell you the following: I think that the events in Yugoslavia, this extremism, are contrary to the idea of a new Europe. Not only the peoples of Europe are against this, but also those of Yugoslavia. The situation is extremely dangerous. Extremism and force are not a solution, one has to talk to each other. Force is no solution, but this, of course, refers only to international force, force from outside, and interference. The conflict must be solved within Yugoslavia's existing state borders. There can be no discussion about that. [end recording]

Pavlov Advocates Political Solution of Crisis

AU2906150391 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 29-30 Jun 91 p 4

["P.M." report: "Pavlov Advocates Dialogue"]

[Text] In the opinion of Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, the development in Yugoslavia is contrary to the "creation of a new Europe" and "brings disaster to the peoples of Yugoslavia." On the sidelines of his visit to Austria, the prime minister talked about the "attempt to solve problems that can only be solved by mutual understanding and on the basis of agreements with extremist actions and the use of force." He seemed to be determined not to point out the sole responsibility of one side.

According to Pavlov, the only solution is the inviolability of the external and internal borders and the principle of noninterference: "The dialogue of the Yugoslav peoples must be voluntary, without any pressure from the outside." And Pavlov reiterated: "The Yugoslav people must achieve a solution exclusively by political means, without the use of force." Guardedly criticizing the former Soviet Government, the Soviet prime minister finally said: "We know from our experience that the use of force leads to a dead end."

Round up of Developments

LD2806215491 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Kondrashov]

[Text] Ljubljana June 28 TASS— Slovenian President of the Presidium Milan Kucan actually rejected today the proposal of the Yugoslav Government to impose a three-month moratorium on the unilateral proclamation of independence and to resume talks on the political restructuring of Yugoslavia.

Speaking at a press conference in Ljubljana, he pointed out that such talks could be resumed on condition that Yugoslav army units would be withdrawn from Slovenia and the federal authorities would compensate for the damage inflicted on the republic. At the same time, Kucan said that the forthcoming days might see the escalation of armed clashes, because the recent session of the presidium of Yugoslavia, at which not all of its members were present, expressed support for the actions of the Yugoslav Popular Army aimed at defending the state borders of Yugoslavia.

According to Kucan, the most difficult decision of the republican leadership was the order, issued on Thursday, on a possibility to resort to force by republican Territorial Self-defence detachments and the police against Yugoslav Army units. "The Slovenian leaders resorted to it because the actions of the army threatened the resolution on the independence and sovereignty of the republic," he said.

Preliminary information about casualties during clashes between Yugoslav Army units and the republican forces was made public at the press conference. By today about ten servicemen of the Yugoslav Army were killed, mostly crew members of five army helicopters, brought down by the anti-aircraft fire.

Three Yugoslav Army soldiers were burned alive in a tank not far from the Brnik airfield, near the Slovenian capital, on Thursday. The tank was destroyed by an anti-tank projectile.

It was stated at the press conference that more and more wounded are being reported by both sides. Their total number exceeded 100.

First prisoners of war appeared in the "undeclared war" in Slovenia. According to Jelko Kacin, minister of information of the republic, the police and territorial defence units captured seven officers and 250 men of the Yugoslav Army. He said that 13 officers and 80 men, mostly Slovenians had deserted the Army.

A spokesman for the information service of the Fifth Military District reported today that two officers and two men of the Yugoslav Army had been killed during armed clashes in Slovenia on Thursday. Eighteen servicemen had been wounded. These data do not include air force and anti-aircraft units. By today 39 men and one officer deserted the Yugoslav Army in that region.

The mission of the Yugoslav Army units was to defend the state border of Yugoslavia. However, during their redeployment they were attacked by the Slovenian

Police and republican Territorial Defence units. Barricades were built at the approaches to some army barracks, water and electricity supply to the barracks were stopped, the movement of army cars, including ambulances, was restricted.

The Yugoslav Federal Secretariat for Popular Defence refuted today the statement of the Slovenian Secretary for Information Jelko Kacin and reports of some foreign mass media on the alleged bombing by Yugoslav warplanes of the Brnik airfield near Ljubljana, the Slovenia TV Centre and some facilities in the city of Maribor.

Steps Taken To Ensure Soviet's Safety

LD2906124191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 29 Jun 91

[By correspondent Boris Zubko]

[Text] Belgrade, 29 Jun (TASS)—In connection with the worsening situation in Yugoslavia, the USSR Embassy in the SFRY, the general consulate in Zagreb, and other organizations are taking measures to ensure the safety of Soviet citizens.

As a TASS correspondent was told in the USSR Embassy in the SFRY, particular attention is being paid to the children from the Chernobyl zone who are vacationing here. There are around 1,500 of them. Two hundred children vacationing in Slovenia, on the Adriatic coast, were evacuated to Zagreb on 28 June, and from there they flew safely out on two special flights to Kiev. One hundred and sixty- eight children on vacation in Croatia in the towns of Podravska Slatina and Osijek have been taken to Belgrade, and will be sent home from there. There are no grounds for concern for children on vacation in other republics in Yugoslavia. They are safe, and regular contact with them is being maintained.

With regard to Soviet specialists working in Yugoslavia, they are all alive and well. None of them has been hurt during the recent events.

Pavlov Meets Austrian Businessmen

LD2806200191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Vienna, 28 Jun (TASS)—During the second half of today, USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov met representatives of Austrian business circles. An open conversation took place on the USSR's economy and on Soviet-Austrian trade and economic relations. According to specialists' evaluations, bilateral trade may decrease during the current year by about 25 percent.

One reason for this, the USSR prime minister explained, is the fact that a number of major contracts connected with the supply of machinery, equipment, materials, and other goods produced by Austrian industry to the Soviet Union expire during 1991-1992. Another reason is the limited hard currency resources in the possesson of the new Soviet partners, who do not yet have sufficient hard currency accumulated, and third, possibly the most serious reason is the slump in production in a number of branches of Soviet industry. Surmounting this is the main task of the anticrisis program elaborated by the government, which it is implementing at the current time.

Many Austrian businessmen who are not against entering the Soviet market and setting up in cooperation with partners in the USSR, are asking the questions: Is it really worth it, is there not excessive risk here? In the opinion of V.S. Pavlov, the level of risk is decreasing. The Soviet economy is in a difficult situation today, but in overcoming difficulties it will inevitably reveal the potential of its market. He recalled the measure being taken in the Soviet Union in the sphere of further reforms of foreign and economic links. It is a matter of fundamental issues of the protection of foreign investments and their being guaranteed. It is proposed that investors should be subject to a national regime [natsionalnyy rezhim], and even receive the right to lease land and to exploit natural resources, and that they be granted a whole series of additional tax and customs privileges. Even more important is the fact that at the current stage of reform in the USSR, the course has been taken for the speedy introduction of internal convertibility for the ruble, he added.

The Austrian partners enquired about how best to act in the conditions currently existing in the Soviet Union, taking into account the issues now arising about the allocation of levels of competency and responsibility, first and foremost between the center and the republics. V.S. Pavlov said that with the signing of the union treaty, the situation in the near future will become more definite and stable. However, even now one may be armed with a principle, one which is comprised of the fact that the enterprise is at the fore—as trade partner and as member of the joint enterprise.

Bessmertnykh, Yanayev Visit Czechoslovakia

Yanayev 'Optimistic' on Relations

LD3006181891 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT 30 Jun 91

[By correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague June 30 TASS—Soviet Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev arrived in Prague today for a meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, which begins on Monday.

Relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have entered a new stage, following talks between Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and Vaclav Havel in Moscow last February and visits to the Soviet Union by Alexander Dubcek and Marian Calfa, Yanayev said.

"I am optimistic about the future of relations between our countries. They should be based on a treaty and work on the treaty is nearing completion," Yanayev said.

"I am convinced that the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will sign the document," he said.

Both Meet Havel

LD3006194791 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 30 Jun 91

[By correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague June 30 TASS—President Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia met Soviet Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev and Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh here today.

Yanayev and Bessmertnykh are visiting Prague for a meeting of the Warsaw treaty Political Consultative Committee.

Yanayev passed Havel a message by President Mikhail Gorbachev.

During the talk, both sides stressed the importance of upgrading relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in line with deep changes going on in the two countries and promoting the European process.

The signing of a new Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty will be a major step in this direction, they said.

The sides expressed satisfaction over an organised withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia.

Both the Soviet command and the Czechoslovak side helped implement the withdrawal, it was said.

The sides discussed the possibility of developing trade and economic relations using new forms, including joint ventures and investment.

Political will to develop bilateral relations on an equal and mutually beneficial basis was expressed.

Bessnertnykh Meets Dienstbier

LD0107010291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2312 GMT 30 Jun 91

[By correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague, 1 Jul (TASS)—A meeting between CSFR Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier and USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh was held here on Sunday evening.

During the meeting, the ministers devoted particular attention to the problems of drafting a new bilateral treaty and to Soviet-Czechoslovak economic cooperation. It was noted that the formulations of the draft treaty, which has not yet been agreed upon, should be finalized in light of the mutual desire of the sides for a strengthening of trust and further development and stabilization of relations. It was ascertained with satisfaction that the fabric of the Soviet-Czechoslovak dialogue on both political and economic problems has recently been becoming more dense. In connection with this, the idea was expressed that there would be some point to stepping up the activities of the Soviet-Czechoslovak mixed commission on economic and scientific-technological cooperation.

Yanayev Meets Prime Minister

LD0107015191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2309 GMT 30 Jun 91

[By correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague, 1 Jul (TASS)—Measures that need to be taken by both sides to overcome serious disruptions that have arisen in economic links between the CSFR and the USSR formed the subject of discussion between Marian Calfa, prime minister of the CSFR Government, and USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev. The meeting took place here on Sunday evening.

During the transitional period, it was pointed out at the meeting, it is necessary to combine market methods with old, tested economic forms. It was stressed that large-scale economic cooperation meets the vital interests of both countries.

Yanayev on 'New' Relations With CSFR

LD3006220491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2020 GMT 30 Jun 91

[By correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague, 30 Jun (TASS)—Alexander Dubcek, chairman of the Federal Assembly of the CSFR, had a meeting here today with USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev, and USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh.

The meeting, at which there was discussion of a broad circle of questions, was attended by Soviet Ambassador to the CSFR Boris Pankin.

In our talks we continued the discussion of the problems that were examined during my trips to Moscow and my talks with the leadership of the USSR and the Russian Federation, Dubcek told the TASS correspondent. The most important thing now is to help what united us in the past and unites us now to be used in the future too. It is necessary not to slacken but to intensify bilateral relations, to seek ways of further developing economic cooperation—including not only trade, but the creation of joint enterprises and participation in construction and other investments. Today Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union are in a situation in which it is difficult to do without each other's support. Democratic transformations should produce specific results, including in the social sphere.

The Soviet-Czechoslovak declaration, signed in Moscow in February of last year by the presidents of the two countries, opened a new page in our history. Now work is being completed on the conclusion of a treaty between the CSFR and USSR. Both sides have an interest in

relations being placed on an equitable footing. This document will help the implementation of tasks we face now and will face tomorrow.

The withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the CSFR, organized to precisely defined schedules, Dubcek continued, is a step that will undoubtedly help to improve Soviet-Czechoslovak relations. It will take some time for everyone to understand this.

The chairman of the Federal Assembly advocated the broadening of cooperation between the parliamentary committees of the CSFR, USSR, and the Russian Federation. Such cooperation, he pointed out, can only be beneficial, especially in the solution of the most urgent problems.

I am deeply satisfied, G. Yanayev said, with my conversation with Alexander Dubcek. Issues of both bilateral cooperation and the pan-European process were discussed in the course of it. This conversation aimed mostly toward the future, although of course the past was also touched upon. On behalf of the Soviet leadership, I unambiguously reiterated once again that the action taken in 1968 was groundless and erroneous. We came to conclusion that it is impossible to move forward while constantly looking back. Scientists and experts first and foremost must analyze the events of the past.

We, for our part, must look toward the future, toward the 21st century, as qualitatively new relations are forming today between the CSFR and the USSR, based on equal rights, a noninterference in each other's internal affairs, and mutual advantage. They are not being built from scratch: there is a good foundation in the shape of friendly ties between the two countries in the recent past. It is necessary to preserve everything positive today, while casting away deforming and negative elements. With the signing of a new political interstate treaty, our relations will become long term and predictable—in politics, trade, the economy, and other spheres.

It must be acknowledged that the transition to hard currency settlements has resulted in established ties that are absolutely essential to both sides being severed. In correcting the situation, we have agreed that there should be a transitional period envisaging barter deals, settlements in national currency, and so on. We need to tackle in earnest the setting up of joint enterprises and joint-stock companies, including on a multilateral basis.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership I thanked Alexander Dubcek and the leaders and citizens of the CSFR for the climate created for the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Everything passed off in a proper and dignified manner. Now, financial and property matters need to be settled in the very same spirit.

A mature politician of great experience, Alexander Dubcek voiced a number of innovative thoughts regarding the setting up of structures and mechanisms to develop the all-European process—in particular maintaining security, which should be guaranteed not only by bilateral but also by collective efforts and agreements.

In the USSR president's message, passed on to Vaclav Havel, Mikhail Gorbachev declares his commitment to giving specific substance to Soviet-Czechoslovak relations, and that he is willing, as soon as the necessary conditions have been created, to meet the Czechoslovak president. The signing of a treaty between the USSR and CSFR could be a condition.

Dashichev Says Tank Use Thwarted in GDR

LD2906205991 Berlin ADN in German 1929 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] Dresden (ADN). According to the former longstanding advisor to the Kremlin, Vyacheslav Dashichev, the former ambassador in Bonn, Valentin Falin, in November 1989 was at the head of a group in the Soviet leadership that wanted to prevent the reunification of Germany by all means. In an interview with the Dresden newspaper "MORGENPOST AM SONNTAG", the political scientist speaks of plans to end the demonstrations in the former GDR by using Soviet tanks. It was mainly thanks to Soviet Foreign Minister Schevardnadze, who has since resigned, that this operation was prevented.

Dashichev, the director of the Institute for International and Political Studies at the Moscow Academy of Sciences, said he estimated that time was up for President Gorbachev. His historic importance was undisputed. However, Gorbachev remains a convinced Communist. He has hardly anything competent left to advise on the issue of economic stabilization. In internal politics, perestroyka first led to a wretched situation, then to crisis, and now chaos is imminent.

East European States Said To Oppose Aid

PM3006143191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Jun 91 First Edition p 5

[Report by IAN correspondent V. Katin: "Not Playing by the Rules"]

[Text] Brussels—As is well known, a meeting of the top leaders of the world's seven leading industrial countries will take place in London in mid-July.

It has been learned in EEC Commission circles in Brussels that the presidents of Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia are also showing interest in the London forum and intend to gain access to it and air their problems. In itself, this intention is perfectly natural. However, there is more to the baggage which they intend to bring to the British capital than meets the eye. Apparently, a major obstacle to the economic development of our erstwhile Warsaw Pact allies is overvigorous aid from the "Seven" to the Soviet Union. According to a report in LES ECHOS, the organ of

Belgian business circles, the leaders of these three East European countries see Western assistance to the USSR as a threat to their own trade. The "logic," if such it can be called, is this: Aid in the form of deliveries of various goods and foodstuffs and the granting of credits to Moscow may reduce exports of Hungarian, Polish, and Czech goods to our country. Information has already percolated to the press to the effect that the three "friendly presidents" are preparing a corresponding political demarche to ensure that the "seven" leaders are in no hurry to assist in solving our problems.

In my view, this conduct is very revealing: Charity begins at home—in other words, national egoism will prevail. East European states receive from the EEC, the United States, and Japan financial aid and credits on such a scale that they are incapable of assimilating or digesting them. But when talk turns to alleviating our difficulties, then immediately they put a spoke in the wheel... Of course, output from Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia is not competitive in the world market and the only place it can still be sold is in the Soviet Union. But there are certain rules of behavior in a civilized society. Europeans would do well to remember this.

Traffic Piles Up at Polish Border

PM3006191591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Truck Rushes Across Border"]

[Text] Warsaw, 26 Jun—The USSR Customs Committee decision to introduce new customs duties as of 1 July has been reflected at the Polish-Soviet border crossing. Thousands of Soviet "entrepreneurs," who often manage to turn up in Poland several times a month using invitations bought on the Warsaw market, are rushing to get back to the Soviet Union before the new duties come into force.

Trucks bearing Soviet license plates have been backed up for many kilometers at border crossings. According to PAP, waiting time at the Terespol-Brest crossing is 48 hours. In order to cross the border at the Lazdiyay-Ogrodniki crossing you need to wait 120 hours, while the figure is 90 hours at the Sheginiye-Medyka crossing.

Those who are exporting scarce goods from the USSR for subsequent sale on the Polish market are clearly worried. Despite the price hikes in the Soviet Union, caviar, canned goods, domestic electronic goods, toys, and many other items whose export is banned continue to find their way onto the Polish secondhand market. Particularly large amounts of liquor are exported to Poland. According to Polish customs figures, 30-50 bottles of vodka are carried in virtually every car. Certain "tourists" have rigged up secret hiding places in their spare wheel, where they manage to conceal a dozen bottles. Unfortunately, small groups of real tourists going to visit relatives have to wait in line on the border behind people holding bought invitations.

There are even conflicts involving our citizens on Poland's western border. PAP reports that a truck carrying two Soviet citizens rammed a border crossing post in Gorzow Voivodship on the German-Polish border Tuesday evening and, evading customs inspection, sped off into the country. The police, having been notified of the incident, only caught up with the intruders in Zielona Gora Voivodship. The truck contained 13 color TV's, which the "guests" had been trying to bring into Poland without paying duty.

Protection of Former E. European Leaders Urged

OW0107055891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jul 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet committees on publicity, international affairs and defence have prepared a draft statement by the Supreme Soviet protecting the rights of former leaders and ruling structures functionaries in East-European countries.

The draft charges that the present leadership and some political circles in some central and East-European countries are mounting a campaign of persecution against the former leaders of those states, party functionaries, members of the security services, and some scientists and other intellectuals. This is dictated by vengeance, find the authors of the statement.

They stress that no man should be a hostage to somebody's political ambitions or a victim of transient emotions or delusions.

The USSR Supreme Soviet appeals to the parliaments of East-European countries and to the German Bundestag for effective measures to stop this spurning of universally recognized democratic principles and basic human rights and freedoms.

Foreign Ministry Official on Withdrawals

OW0107074991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report: "Soviet Troop Withdrawals From Czechoslovakia Cause Less Headache Than Those From Hungary"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The deputy in charge of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's 3rd Department for Europe, Mr Vasiliy Svirin, told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent that Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev and Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh who will be members of the Soviet delegation at Warsaw Pact's political consultative committee meeting in Prague on July 1 are due to meet Czechoslovak leaders to discuss the prospects of bilateral relations. Indicatively, said Mr Svirin, the new round of talks will come hot on the heels of Soviet troop withdrawals from Czechoslovakia.

He said that troop withdrawals passed off without an upsurge of anti-Sovietism and in an atmosphere which he described as very good. The two countries are due to sign a bilateral agreement on property issues soon because of the absence of difficulties arising in Hungary.

Mr Svirin spoke of wide-ranging consultations between the two countries with an aim of signing a bilateral political treaty. The Soviet diplomatic described the atmosphere of discussions about the treaty's main provisions as friendly and constructive.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry sees no anti-Soviet thrust in the desire by Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary to coordinate their foreign policy effort. Mr Svirin said his country's attitude was calm because all of this was part of the European process.

West Europe

Pavlov Continues Visit to Austria

Pavlov Meets Waldheim

LD2806150991 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Vienna June 28 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov today paid a visit to Austrian Federal President Kurt Waldheim.

The two statesmen had talks of mutual interest mainly focusing on Soviet-Austrian relations. Both sides stressed the importance of their further effective development and adjustment to new realities in Europe.

The president showed lively interest in Soviet reforms and stressed that Austria was interested in the stabilization of the situation in the Soviet Union.

They also discussed the situation in Europe and expressed concern over the situation in Yugoslavia. During their conversation held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and amiability, they favoured the further development of the Helsinki and European integration processes.

Federal President Kurt Waldheim of Austria gave lunch in honour of the Soviet visitor.

Discusses Cooperation With Fischer

LD2806104391 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna June 28 TASS—The second day of Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's official visit to Austria proved eventful and fruitful. Pavlov is currently here at the invitation of Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky and the Austrian Government.

Main attention during the talks in Vienna is being given to bilateral relations, primarily to trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation.

This is understandable: The Soviet Union ranks tenth among Austria'a leading trading partners. Soviet deliveries are of considerable importance for meeting the central European country's import requirements.

Last year, according to the press, the Soviet Union accounted for more than 90 per cent of the Austrian import of natural gas, and over 30 per cent of iron ore. Reciprocal trade grew by 70 per cent compared to 1980. At the same time trade between the two counries developed unevenly of late and therefore an important task is to elevate cooperation to a proper level.

This idea was voiced during Pavlov's meeting with Heinz Fischer, president of the National Council (parliament). The interlocutors spoke out in favour of stimulating bilateral contacts in various fields.

They pointed out the need for further refinement of the legal basis of Soviet-Austrian relations to reflect qualitative changes taking place on the European continent and to accord with the present-day development.

Holds News Conference With Vranitzky

LD2806162191 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Vienna June 28 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov and Chancellor Franz Vranitzky of Austria held a joint news conference, attracting newsmen from all over the world.

The Austrian chancellor stressed that relations between Austria and the USSR have always been good and cordial and said that his talks with Pavlov covered a wide range of problems concerning bilateral relations, including deeper economic cooperation, more intensive commodity turnover, investments and financing, as well as manager training and the transfer of advanced technologies for a number of industrial projects. The chancellor described cooperation in the field of culture, research and development as a major part of Soviet-Austrian exchanges. Valentin Pavlov told journalists that he and Vranitzky discussed an extensive range of economic and political problems aiming to preserve, under the conditions of the transitional period in the Soviet economy and society, the achievements accumulated over many years of Soviet-Austrian cooperation and further deepen and perfect bilateral relations.

When asked about his attitude to developments in Yugoslavia, Pavlov replied that in his view the development of events in that country is very dangerous and said that it was running counter to the interests not only of European countries but also of the peoples of that Balkan state.

"This," the Soviet prime minister said," is yet another attempt to use extremist actions and force to solve problems which cannot be solved by pressure."

According to Valentin Pavlov, problems of this kind can be resolved only on the basis of mutual understanding and mutual agreements.

The Austrian chancellor replied to a similar question by most categorically condemning the use of force in Yugoslavia. Violence cannot solve the problem, it is unable to bring about the solution of any political problems, he said.

Completes Talks

LD2906220591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Network in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The official three-day visit to Austria by USSR Prime Minister Pavlov ended today. In the morning, the head of the Soviet government and the experts accompanying him visited the Austrian parliament. A conversation took place with Mr. Fischer, president of the National Council, and parliamentarians. The talk was about intensifying bilateral parliamentary links.

Later, there were official talks at the federal chancellor's office on trade, credit and finance with a view to increasing the rate of growth of trade between our countries. An important role in the intensification of Soviet-Austrian economic relations will be played by an agreement between our countries on reciprocal protection of capital investments. Articles ratifying this agreement were exchanged, allowing Austria's business people to have greater confidence that money invested in the Soviet Union will not be lost. This was noted at a joint news conference by the USSR prime minister and the Austrian federal chancellor.

Comrade Pavlov then called on Austrian President Kurt Waldheim. The sides were united in the view that there is a need for further affirmation of the priority of political methods over forcible methods in the solution of international problems. They also spoke of the tragic events brought about by nationalism in Yugoslavia, which is undermijning the people's well-being.

At the invitaion of Austria's federal economic chamber the head of the Soviet government addressed representatives of business circles.

Leaves Salzburg for Moscow

LD2906203691 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] Vienna June 29 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov visited today the city of Salzburg, in the north-west of Austria. The city, situated in the picturesque valley of the Salzach river, is famous not only for its cultural traditions and architectural monuments. It has 6,000 trade and 3,000 handicraft firms.

Pavlov familiarised himself with the municipal economy and the infrastructure of Salzburg, which has the population of 150,000.

This year about all cultural activities in Salzburg are keynoted by the 200th anniversary of Mozart. The Soviet prime minister visited the house in which the great composer lived and worked. Now it is a memorial museum.

On the same day Pavlov left Salzburg for Moscow. He was seen off at the airport by Franz Vranitzky and other officials, as well as Soviet Ambassador to Austria Valery Popov.

Vranitzky on Visit

PM2806093391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet Premier Expected"]

[Text] Vienna—Discussion of the economic aspects of the development of Soviet-Austrian relations will take center stage in USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's upcoming visit to Austria. Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky stated this here Monday at a meeting with foreign journalists accredited in Vienna.

The Austrian Government head noted that one of the most complex problems on the path to broadening and intensifying mutual ties between the two states is the search for reliable partners to conclude agreements with. Before, when the administrative-edict system and its apparatus still existed, everything was more or less clear. And although it could not boast of efficiency, on the other hand it could guarantee a certain reliability. But now that the old structures have been destroyed, it is much more difficult for many Austrian entrepreneurs to orient themselves in the changed circumstances and to find the necessary contacts.

Vranitzky on Trade

PM2806121591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by S. Tosunyan: "How To Use Austrian Credits"]

[Text] Vienna—Soviet Prime Minister V. Pavlov will arrive in Austria 27 June on an official visit. In addition to Vienna he will visit Linz and Salzburg. The program includes talks with Austrian Federal Chancellor F. Vranitzky, a meeting with businessmen and a visit to the Vienna town council and the "FYEST-Alpine shtal AG" [name as transliterated] state enterprise.

One of the main themes at the talks will be economic relations between the two countries. Last year these relations developed quite well. Trade turnover compared

with 1989 increased markedly. Our exports to Austria, for instance, increased 28 percent. And not only through the sale of raw material, as used to be the case, but also through deliveries of machinery and equipment. Austrian firms are eager to acquire from us "Belarus" tractors, Lada automobiles, subassemblies for ships, and electrical goods. Last year we purchased in Austria goods worth 1.33 billion rubles [R]—an increase of nearly 13 percent. They were mainly light industry articles: shoes, clothing, textiles, underwear, and equipment for processing agricultural output.

In the past few years over 150 Austrian firms have founded joint ventures in our country which are creating very necessary output. Thus, the Soviet-Austrian "Petrofoyt" joint venture in Petrozavodsk produces papermaking machinery in demand not only in our country but also in other countries. Our "Verkhnevolzhskkabel" plant and the Austrian MAG firm together produce superfine wire for enterprises of the electronics industry. The Ukrainian "Fakel" firm and the "Fronius" plant have created the "Interfakel" venture for the series production of small-scale transformers and welding apparatuses. This output is very useful in repairing tractors and at other establishments.

But as of January this year things have gone worse. The contracts which have been concluded are not being fulfilled on time by our enterprises and some Austrian firms, because their Soviet partners have not transferred money on time, have suspended the delivery of output. Delays in paying for purchases and sometimes even the refusal of individual Soviet trading organizations to pay their debts have placed Austrian firms which have been cooperating with us for many years on the verge of bankruptcy.

At a meeting with foreign journalists accredited to Vienna, Chancellor F. Vranitzky, speaking of the economic relations between the USSR and Austria, expressed surprise that the Soviet side is not using the credits it has obtained in Austria to lend dynamism to trade relations. Of the last 8 billion [currency not specified] credit half still remains unused. The chancellor said that these and other questions of cooperation will undoubtedly be reflected in his talks with V. Pavlov.

Austria and the USSR have a large amount of experience of mutually advantageous cooperation, F. Vranitzky believes. The Soviet market's potential is enormous, he said. We must evidently think together about how to expand and deepen economic relations in order to obtain more benefit. That is in our peoples' interests.

Germans Disguised as Soviet Servicemen Detained

LD2706094291 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 26 Jun 91

[By correspondent Konstantin Savvin]

[Text] Berlin June 26 TASS—An officer of the Western Group of Soviet Troops (WGT), while on the way to his place of service, caught three people dressed up as Soviet Army servicemen in the act of robbing a German car in Leipzig.

Two of the criminals managed to flee, while the third one, in the uniform of a Soviet sergeant, was detained by the officer and handed over to German police. The detainee turned out to be a German woman born in 1975.

This was reported by the WGT press service on Tuesday. The press centre's statement points out that German media from time to time feature reports about offences allegedly committed by WGT servicemen against the local population.

However, upon a detailed examination, it transpires that people that commit offences are quite often German citizens clad in Soviet military uniform. For example, two German citizens were detained when they were breaking into a car garage near a WGT military unit in Neustrelitz recently.

Such actions by German citizens do not promote trust and mutual understanding between Soviet troops in Germany and the German population, the statement emphasises.

German Detained at Soviet Facilities in Golssen

LD2906103191 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By correspondent Mikhail Voronenkov]

[Text] Berlin June 29 TASS—The press centre of the Western Group of Soviet troops on Friday issued a statement pointing to numerous attempts by German citizens to get into the territory guarded by Soviet soldiers.

A similar incident happened on June 27 near Golssen, Brandenburg Land.

At 2:02 A.M. Private D. Khasilov detained a German citizen who had penetrated the restricted area through wire entanglements.

Various means that could be used for arson, a bunch of keys and sacks were found on him. The detainee, Wilfried Dietzsch, born in 1950, is a resident of Berlin's Adlershof district.

Dietzsch has been handed over to the German criminal police.

Military Authorities Deny German Missile Story

LD3006105891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1113 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] Berlin, 29 June (TASS)—Correspondent Igor Osinskiy: Any reader opening yesterday's editions of the BERLINER ZEITUNG, TAGESSPIEGEL, and certain other newspepars would have been horrified by what he

saw there. A picture taken by photographer Jan Bauer purported to show Soviet surface-to-air missiles abandoned in woods near Bernau without any guard whatsoever. According to the report, these missiles now pose a deadly threat to people out for a walk. Indeed, the idea of stumbling over missiles when all you want to do is pick mushrooms is not exactly a pleasant one!

A TASS correspondent contacted the press center of the Western Group of Forces and asked for an explanation of how some 100 Soviet missiles could go missing in woods near Berlin. The explanation is quite simple, as it turns out. The missiles snapped by the resourceful reporter do not in fact belong to the Soviet army at all, but to the Bundeswehr, which took them over from the GDR national people's army. According to Lieutenant Colonel Wolfgang Hoppe, commander of the Bundeswehr's 41st Air Defense Brigade, the missiles are stored in an area specially set aside for the purpose. They are surrounded with barbed wire and guarded day and night. They will soon be cut up and handed over for scrap. Hoppe described the photographer's actions as criminal.

The standpoint of the newspapers which published these fabrications is astounding. Clearly, as the Western Group of Forces press center pointed out, the urge to gather "cold war" mushrooms in places where they have long ceased to grow remains strong...

However, our colleagues on the BERLINER ZEITUNG must be given their due. Having made fools of themselves, either wittingly or unwittingly, they decided that today they would publish a detailed report from the ill-starred wood in which the missiles were found. The report even gives the height of the barbed wire surrounding the dump. However, they did not, unfortunately, find space in which to correct the falsification which they themselves published, or to apologize to the Soviet servicemen on whom asperations were cast, even if they were not ill-intentioned. What a pity! This would have been a useful contribution to creating the atmosphere of trust which Berlin's journalists stress so much.

Koivisto on Relations With USSR, RSFSR

PM2806103791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Useful Dialogue"]

[Text] The state of Finnish-Soviet economic ties is the subject of Finnish President Mauno Koivisto's special attention. That was the conclusion drawn from what he told Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center 25 June, and this subject dominated the meeting.

Fresh problems are arising, the president said, notably due to the Soviet Unon's decentralization of its economy and the appearance of new protagonists—the USSR's republics—in the international arena. We are keeping a very attentive eye, the guest went on, on the course of transformations in the Soviet Union and are interested in the fate of the Union Treaty and in how relations take shape between the center and the republics. Assessments of the opportunities for Finnish exporters depend on all this. Trade and economic relations occupied a prominent place in the talks during my visit, M. Koivisto pointed out. We sought means of overcoming the difficulties. There is a desire to advance, he went on to say. Finland will trade with the USSR even under difficult conditions.

Journalists inquired about the content of M. Koivisto's meeting with B.N. Yeltsin. We discussed certain questions of mutual interest, the president replied. The examination will continue in Finland, when the Russian Government sends its representatives there. Yeltsin and I came to an understanding of the need to preserve everything that has been achieved in relations between Finland and the Soviet Union.

Summing up the results of his visit to Moscow, the Finnish leader voiced a positive opinion of the visit, describing his meetings and conversations here as very interesting.

Mafia Trying To Produce Drugs in USSR

PM3006182591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent N. Miroshnik: "Statement By J. Ruml"]

[Text] Rome, 27 Jun—There have been numerous specific pieces of information confirming that the Italian mafia, in collaboration with Soviet organized crime, is trying to establish centers for the production of drugs on USSR territory.

The admission was made in an interview for the Italian agency ANSA by Czechoslovak Deputy Internal Affairs Minister Jan Ruml.

Concerning the Italian mafia's penetration into Czechoslovakia and the laundering of criminally obtained funds via the privatization process, J. Ruml noted that there are no specific data on this as yet. But "it is a reasonable assumption" that international organized crime, engaged in producing and trading in drugs, is placing money it has "earned" from this in Czech banks.

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuba's Aldana Visits Moscow

Meets Gorbachev

LD2806195791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1828 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev today received Carlos Aldana, member of the Secretariat

of the Communist Party of Cuba, who is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

In a frank and comradely conversation they examined fundamental issues of the development of Soviet-Cuban relations. They confirmed their desire for consistent strengthening of the traditional friendly ties between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Cuba and stressed the urgency of consolidating the positive changes that are taking place in world politics on the path toward equal and mutually beneficial cooperation among all states.

Talks With Yanayev

LD3006092191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] USSR Vice President Yanayev received Carlos Aldana in the Kremlin today. In the course of their meeting, the two informed each other of the situation in their countries and the efforts being made by the USSR and Cuban leaderships to tackle economic and social problems. The state of and prospects for Soviet-Cuban ties in various spheres, including economic cooperation, were analyzed in detail. Mutual interest was expressed in the further strengthening and development of traditional relations of friendship between the Soviet and Cuban peoples and, between the USSR and the Cuban Republic. [video shows Yanayev and Aldana shaking hands, the Soviet and Cuban delegations seated at a table]

Talks With Frolov

PM2806102991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

["Own Information" report: "Guests of PRAVDA"]

[Text] Yesterday I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, met with a delegation of Cuban Communists headed by Carlos Aldana, secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee. The delegation is in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

They had a sincere and businesslike exchange of opinions on a broad range of problems linked with bilateral interstate and interparty relations and the situation in both countries and on the international arena. C. Aldana spoke about the upcoming Fourth PCC Congress in October and the economic difficulties that are adversely affecting the domestic political situation. He noted the Cuban people's determination to continue their chosen path of socialist transformations and friendship with the Soviet Union. For his part, I.T. Frolov spoke about the complex processes and changes in the country and the situation within the CPSU and confirmed the Soviet political leadership's desire to develop and improve friendly relations with Cuba.

C. Aldana, secretary of the PCC Central Committee, conveyed via PRAVDA greetings to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from Fidel Castro, leader of the Cuban revolution.

Jose Balaguer, Cuban ambassador plenipotentiary and extraordinary to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

Opinions Divided on Survival of Castro Regime

OW0107061991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

["Viewpoint" report; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Another VCIOM [National Public Opinion Studies Center] poll, which took place on June 8-18, invited 2,061 people chosen according to the national representative sample to answer the question "Do you think the socialist regime in Cuba will last until the end of this year?"

Forty-one percent said the regime would be sure to mark its next anniversary yet.

Sixteen percent said it would collapse in the near future.

Forty-three percent expressed no definite opinion on the matter.

The error margin was set at 3 percent.

Chilean Businessmen Continue Visit

Minister Gives Letter to Gorbachev

PY2906121291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] As we have previously reported businessmen continued to meet at the Soviet-Chilean center today. This meeting is being held under the rubric USSR-Chile: New Opportunities for Cooperation.

A report by Radio Moscow correspondent Viktor Zukhov states: This morning the head of the Chilean delegation, Economy Minister Carlos Ominami met with Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev. The Kremlin meeting lasted one hour and 15 minutes. At Yanayev's request, Ominami explained the Chilean economic process, its characteristics, the changes that are taking place in this area.

Ominami also delivered to Yanayev a letter from President Aylwin to President Mikhail Gorbachev. In the letter Aylwin reiterates the Chilean Government's wish to maintain good relations with the Soviet Union and its praise for the Soviet leader's efforts. A formal invitation to visit Chile was also extended to President Gorbachev.

Ominami pointed out that Chile would be honored to receive a visit from President Gorbachev. Yanayev replied that President Gorbachev is very interested in what is going on in Chile.

Today Ominami visited Leningrad, and the Chilean businessmen continue to maintain contacts with leaders of several Soviet enterprises and organizations interested in cooperating with Chile. For example, an accord for the creation of a mixed Chilean-Soviet enterprise has just been signed. Here are remarks by Orlando Saenz, chairman of the Chilean company [name indistinct]: [Begin Saenz recording] In my opinion this is a very new operation because this is not a mixed enterprise created in Chile but created in the Soviet Union to produce in this country. The accord signed yesterday provides for the creation of a mixed enterprise in [name indistinct] that will produce special paint, especially that of the naval type.

This enterprise includes the local paint factory. I was told that [word indistinct], the Soviet organization of fishing sector workers, has expressed interest in becoming a customer. The Chilean enterprise includes [name indistinct], a Chilean paint enterprise and other enterprises. They are shareholders in the enterprise that has just been created. [end recording] The definitive accord was signed yesterday. The businessmen went to [name indistinct] to take the first step toward starting up the industry.

The meeting among Soviet and Chilean businessmen will conclude on Friday, 29 June.

Primakov Talks With Chilean Minister

PM2806093591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 p 3

[Report by D. Kulik: "First Steps To Accommodate One Another"]

[Text] Representatives of USSR and Chilean business circles have met in Moscow. Yesterday Ye.M. Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, received C. Ominami, Chilean economy minister. Clodimiro Almeyda, Chilean ambassador to the USSR, was present during the conversation, along with K.A. Khachaturov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Cooperation and Solidarity With Latin America. During an interview with our correspondent he said that questions linked with the Group of Seven conference in London and the USSR's stance at this conference were discussed in the course of the meeting, which was of a businesslike and constructive nature. According to K. Khachaturov, Ye. Primakov and C. Ominami discussed the issue of the Soviet economy's transition to market relations. The opinion held by the economy minister of a country that recently made the move from dictatorship to democracy—without a fall in the standard of living—is of no small importance for us.

This the first time in 20 years that a member of Chile's Cabinet of Ministers has visited our country. We hope that this is only the beginning of cooperation between our states at government level. C. Ominami is to have meetings at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and with the minister of foreign economic relations over the next few days.

RSFSR Minister on Business Links

OW2806125391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "Chilean businessmen show great interest in developing economic links with Russia" said the Russian Federation's Minister for Economic Links Victor Yaroshenko after meeting with the Chilean Economics Minister Carlos Ominami and members of the Chilean business delegation in the Soviet Union. Chile's experience in reaching high economic performance, he went on, is of some interest for Russia. He advocated, for instance, sparing taxation on Chile's example. The moderate export and import duties were recently cut there from 15 to 11 percent. C. Ominami pointed out that the duties imposed by the Soviet central government on goods that could be imported from Chile stand at 100-150 percent. "From a business point of view," stressed the Chilean Minister, "this is just unthinkable". V. Yaroshenko handed to C. Ominami a draft agreement on trade and economic cooperation. The sides agreed to continue the dialogue.

Cooperation Agreement Signed

PY2706180491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] The Chilean businessmen's delegation that participated in the meeting USSR-Chile New Cooperation Opportunities continues its visit to the Soviet Union today. On 26 June the two countries signed a new economic cooperation agreement. Our correspondent Victor Zukhov was present during the signing ceremony:

[Begin recording] [Zukhov] The agreement was signed at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations at noon today by Minister Konstantin Katushev and Chilean Economy Minister Carlos Ominami, head of the businessmen's delegation. Those attending the ceremony included Clodomiro Almeyda, Chilean ambassador to the USSR; other Chilean diplomats; members of the businessmen delegation; Karen Khachaturov, president of the Soviet Committee for Cooperation and Solidarity with Latin American countries; Soviet officials; and Chilean and Moscow journalists. Minister Katushev told them that the agreement opens a new stage in the economic relations between Chile and the USSR. Katushev hoped to reach and surpass past exchange levels established by the 1977 agreement. This is what Chilean Economy Minister Carlos Ominami said:

[Ominami] I think it is very important to have a legal document establishing a clear framework for the development of the exchange in the field of [word indistinct]. The government is willing to make the necessary effort to be present in the Soviet Union and to attempt to recover

the time lost due to the previous lack of relations. Ours country is far from the Soviet Union but we are quite interested in the development of your internal process. We believe it will significantly contribute to developing the Soviet people and the international economy. Our entrepreneurs want to participate in this process, and we are doing everything possible to move in that direction. We members of the government will work to see that conditions for these activities are as smooth, positive, and beneficial as possible.

[Zukhov] Minister Ominami answered questions from Chilean and Soviet journalists. He mentioned, among other things, his meeting yesterday with Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, during which the two leaders spoke of President Gorbachev's willingness to radicalize the market economy program, which in Ominami's opinion, will permit Chile's participation. Tomorrow Minister Ominami will meet with USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yenayev.

Agreement Reached on Relations With Belize

LD2606124291 Moscow TASS in English 0821 GMT 26 Jun 91

[By correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] New York June 26 TASS—Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations Yuliy Vorontsov and Belizean Ambassador to the United Nations Carl Lindbergh Bernard Rogers signed a joint communique on the establishment of diplomatic relations between their countries.

In a ceremony at the Soviet Union's Permanent Mission to the U.N. the two envoys also exchanged notes that are tantamount to an agreement on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries.

The governments of the Soviet Union and Belize, the communique said, guided by the desire to promote relations of friendship and cooperation and proceeding from the basic principles of international law, decided to establish, from June 25,1991, diplomatic relations at the level of embassies and, as the first step, exchange ambassadors (on the basis of concurrency).

It is noteworthy that diplomatic relations are being established between our two countries at a time when the cold war is over and the East begins to build relations with the Caribbean countries, Carl Rogers told TASS. We are the pioneers in this process. We shall study each other's potential for trade, technical cooperation and other fields. The Soviet Union was one of the first to support our drive for independence. This became one of the decisive prerequisites for the establishment of diplomatic relations.

Supreme Soviet

Heated Debate Over Privatization Law

LD2806111791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1000 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Excerpts] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet: We go over to the correspondent's post of All-Union radio in the Kremlin. At the microphone is our parliamentary correspondentk Vladimir Perfilyev.

[Perfilyev] Today, under the chairmanship of Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, a joint sitting is being held of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities [passage omitted]

The members of the Supreme Soviet continued the discussion of the USSR draft law on the basic principles of removing state influence and the privatization of enterprises, a law which has been under discussion here for a very long time, and very heatedly. The temperature of the parliamentary reading has risen just like the temperature outside here now. There have been the most varied opinions. Deputy Edvard Grinovskis, a professor at the Latvian Agricultural Academy, said that attempts are being made to torpedo the adoption of this law in order to make Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's position in London more difficult. But well-known deputy Leonid Ivanovich Sukhov said, even if I am a conservative three times over, I shall try to ensure that the working population and the working class do not suffer as a result of the adoption of this law.

Just now Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov put forward the proposal to adopt the law in principle, but without discussing articles 10 and 11 on the forms of removing state influence and privatization, and the transformation of state enterprises into joint stock associations and other economic and public companies. It is precisely these two articles which are delaying the adoption of the law. A heated discussion is now going on over them as I can see on the monitor. As to whether a decision will be made to adopt the law in principle or not, we shall report in our next bulletin, but now I conclude by reportage from the Kremlin.

Draft Law Adopted

OW0107073591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the USSR has adopted as a whole the draft law on the fundamental principles of denationalisation and privatisation of enterprises and proceeded to debate it article by article. When the draft law was put to the vote as a whole, articles 10 (on organisation of the denationalisation and privatisation effort) and 19 (on the use of proceeds from denationalisation and privatisation) were left out because a group of People's Deputies had submitted alternative varsions of these articles.

As the draft was debated, Deputy Vavil Nosov claimed privatisation was a move aimed at breaking apart the socialist state and the election of Russia's President was the price that had been paid for mistakes made by the Supreme Soviet and the President of the USSR.

Deputy Ervid Grinovskis told parliament that he had received a document of a certain political organisation threatening retribution if he voted in favour of denationalisation and privatisation of state property. He said that in his view this was evidence that some political forces had an interest in disrupting or making more difficult Gorbachev's meeting with G-7 heads of state in London.

Mr. Anatoliy Lukyanov said a similar document was in his possession too.

One of the leaders of the interregional group of deputies, Mr. Sergey Ryabachenko, told IF [INTERFAX] that these threats need not be taken seriously, although such political forces as the United Workers' Front are indeed interested in an exarcerbation of confrontation over this issue.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Employment Problems

OW2806115991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Thursday, an enlarged meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet's committees and commissions discussed the problems of employment. On July 1, the Law on Employment goes into effect. In experts' estimate, about 30 percent of the workfit population will become unemployed, the speakers said.

The Central Asian republics will be hit the hardest. Already, there are millions of unemployed there. However, in these particular republics there are no unemployment benefit funds.

In the Russian Federation unemployment is not so acute because there is a shortage of workforce in it. And yet, both the Russian Federation and the Ukraine have envisaged measures to deal with unemployment. The Russian Federation has reserved 1 billion rubles from the budget for this purpose. In the Ukraine, the sum amounts to 200 million rubles, but is expected to increase to 2 billion before the end of the year.

USSR Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, V. Paulman told IF [INTERFAX] that the number of unemployed is growing. In the first quarter of the year jobs were sought by about 100,000 people, which is two times more than during the first three months of 1990. Only 20 percent of the unemployed have found jobs.

Supreme Soviet Session 28 June

LD2806200291

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1840 GMT on 28 June carries the "At the USSR Supreme Soviet session" report on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 28 June.

At 1843 GMT the announcer says that today the session discussed the draft law on privatization, which aroused a stormy debate. Lukyanov asks for article by article discussion

Next Boyko from the legislation committee speaks from the podium. He said that we need a clear understanding of what privatization is. People do not understand what this law is about. The law is necessary. He gives a definition of destatification and privatization as the law determines it.

Lukyanov asks for further explanation of these concepts. The deputy continues explaining that destatification entails a change in the form of management, but not in the form of ownership. Privatization means state property passing into collective or private hands.

At 1851 GMT deputy Golubev from the floor comes to the podium on behalf of the Justice Ministry to discuss its view of this law. He says: This law is devoted to the transformation of forms of property. Destatification entails the transforming state enterprises into enterprises based on any other kind of property, e.g. collective, joint-stock, and leased enterprises. He disagrees with some of the points made by the previous speaker. The law does not allow any state interference in the control of the property of enterprises.

Deputy Kostishin asks from the floor if the state can participate in a joint-stock company. The response is it can. Kostishin says that if this is the case then nothing has changed. Golubev explains that the property of a joint-stock company is its property—any state body participating only has shares in the company, it does not own the company's property.

A deputy asks why it is necessary to privatize now. Are we changing from a socialist system to a capitalist one?

Lukyanov takes it upon himself to answer this question. He says: The character of society does not change with the arisal of a variety of forms of property. Even now there are various forms of property. Destatification does not contradict the character of our society. I do not agree with those who think that private property is the only way. Even in the West there are different types of property.

A deputy asks Boyko about the level of property whether it is republican or union.

Boyko says that this law concerns union property. As regards republican property, the Supreme Soviet should create only the general framework for the republics to privatise their own property according to local conditions.

At 1906 GMT deputies ask for further clarification of the meaning of privatization.

In reply, Boyko talks of the need to destatify state enterprises. In the first stage small enterprises should be sold off, namely shops. Peasant farms should be formed on the basis of the property of collective farms.

Next, at 1911 GMT, Lukyanov talks about the work of the legislation commission on this matter. They have spent much time looking at foreign experience. They have tried to fall between the two extremes who want complete privatization and those who want none and find a consensus.

A deputy asks that another variant proposed by him be examined. Boyko explains why his proposal is not practical.

At 1915 GMT Lukyanov says that this law on privatization must be adopted because some republics have already developed their own privatization legislation, and the union law is necessary as a framework and to help preserve the union.

He goes on to say that proposals have been received that enterprise work forces vote in secret on the fate of their firms.

Next a deputy at the podium explains his disagreements with the draft law. Nevetheless, he has voted for the commission's draft because heknows of the hard work which has gone into it. He proposes that the draft be voted on as a whole and then debated article by article.

At 1920 GMT Lukyanov asks if the draft can be voted on with the exclusion of articles 10, 11, and 19. The vote is 261 for, 56 against, and 27 abstained in the Soviet of the Union. The Soviet of Nationalities did not have a quorum.

Deputy Umalatova asks procedural question concerning voting.

The Soviet of Nationalities votes again, 134 for, 31 against, and 17 abstained. So the law adopted in principle.

At 1925 GMT there is a vote on whether to forward the law to be examined by the Congress of People's Deputies. The vote is 50 for, 248 against, so the law has to be completed here. Now article by article discussion begins.

The announcer winds up by saying that deputies discussed the first nine articles at the evening session. Work will continue on Monday.

Political & Social

Opinions Vary on Purpose of Proposed New Party

OW0107065691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] An organisational meeting is to be held in Moscow today by a group initiating a new democratic movement. INTERFAX has information that among those attending will be Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Arkadiy Volskiy, Gavriil Popov, Vadim Bakatin, Galina Starovoytova, and Nikolay Travkin. The meeting is expected to elect an organisational committee. The participants see the meeting as a "purely working" one and have not invited the press.

The founding fathers are known to disagree among themselves concerning the organisational principles. Moscow's Mayor G. Popov is for a United Democratic Party which would involve all movements and parties of democratic shade. Such a party, G. Popov said at yesterday's congress of the Russian Federation's Republican Party, "could undertake certain obligations concerning discipline, organisation and order".

In the opinion of E. Shevardnadze, it should be not a party, but a movement or alliance. He remarked yesterday in an interview with INTERFAX that a party could be formed at a later stage.

It has become known to INTERFAX that Aleksandr Yakovlev has sent a letter to the meeting saying that "the question of a party has not been prepared yet. Before it can be formed much work is to be done in the republics".

A. Yakovlev finds it advisable to return to the original idea of "a public political alliance for democratic reforms". The main thing is to seek alliance and not disunity—urges Yakovlev. He suggests a founding congress in September which could transform the new movement into a Democratic Party of the Soviet Union.

Shevardnadze Urges 'Constructive Opposition'

OW0107024591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Report: "What We Need Is Constructive Opposition of Democratic Trend, Said E. Shevardnadze"; transmitted by KYODO; quotation marks as received]

[Text] A series of statements and interviews as to the prospects of forming a new democratic party in the USSR were published lately. They were given by G. Popov, S. Shatalin, V. Shostakovskiy, and others. In this connection, E. Shevardnadze, president of the Soviet Foreign Policy Association, has given an exclusive interview for the news agency "INTERFAX".

Time has come to create a constructive opposition of democratic trend in this country, said E. Shevardnadze. In his interview for IF [INTERFAX] the former Soviet foreign minister said: "We need this to overcome the crisis in the country, save democracy, prevent all attempts to relapse into the old order and totalitarian regime."

E. Shevardnadze said that at the moment "We needn't necessarily set up a new party, but rather a movement or an alliance, and form a party at the next stage, at a founding congress".

"It's too early to talk of rules or programmes," he said, "but the work is in train, there are some proposals and variants. We can't yet know what document will come out of it. I also have my views on the subject, somewhat different from those of my colleagues. But presently, we have to decide on many questions".

The new organisation, went on E. Shevardnadze, could unite all the democratic forces in the Soviet Union except the diehard conservatives and radical reactionaries opposing the democratic values.

"We are holding intensive consultations concerning the methods and forms of action. We are talking to practically all the democratic forces in the country. We'll clarify the situation in the coming days. That will be a great event," promised E. Shevardnadze.

Asked if it would be required of a former member of the Communist Party to renounce it to join the new opposition movement, E. Shevardnadze replied, "If we set up an alliance, not a party, that would enable all the democratically-minded people to take part in the movement." "Consolidation of the democratic forces including democratically thinking communists is of tremendous importance now. If we set the condition of leaving the Communist Party, or any other party, we'd face people with a choice, and probably scare away some democratic people. That would be a mistake since our goal is to rally all the democratic forces," pointed out Eduard Shevardnadze.

"This won't be a confrontational organization (constructive opposition: IF). The people are tired of strife, slogans, and demagogy. We should build a real force standing for deeper reforms. Its interests will focus on the individual and then on all the rest, said E. Shevardnadze. "We are willing to support all that is sensible and right. Besides, we should have a firm foundation to resist irrational and harmful decisions, no matter what corridors of power they stem from".

Eduard Shevardnabze said that building up a constructive democratic opposition is all the more important in face of consolidating reactionary forces who have unleashed a war against the policy of restructuring and renewal, against the new thinking and its supporters." "In these conditions, the recent shift of the country's leadership to the right was inevitable," he went on, "It was needed by the leaders, including the President, to have a basis for their executive powers".

According to E. Shevardnadze, at the moment two factors are in evidence:

1. Because of some of its functionaries in the center and elsewhere, the CPSU, despite its decision to launch perestroyka, is deprived of the opportunity to genuinely be in the forefront of the efforts to renovate the country.

2. The newly-born democratic movement is not in a position to put up even minimally united resistance to the reactionary forces which have the efficient structures, strength, and opportunity to undermine the policy of reforms.

The new association, E. Shevardnadze went on to say, could unite all democratic forces in the Soviet Union, apart from diehard conservatives and radical minded reactionaries who oppose democratic changes.

"What I stand for, and I've mentioned this more than once, is to build a well-balanced two party system in our society", he said. Whether the CPSU splits or not, we need a constructive opposition that would exist parallel to it. That would make the political process more dynamic, thanks to suggested alternatives and emerging institutions compatible with the state. They would criticize the state and cooperate with it, offer the country their solutions."

Unfortunately, many people in our country see the opposition, continued E. Shevardnadze, as a hostile force undermining the Central Government. That needn't be so. A normal society has an opposition as a natural feature of political landscape. It stimulates the entral authority to take resolute steps, seek bold solutions. This is precisely what we need now".

Speaking on the feeling in the country concerning such a movement, E. Shevardnadze said "It enjoys support, is popular with various strata of the population." He mentioned his contacts with workers and managers of large enterprises, with some intellectuals. The idea was welcomed by members of newly-formed political parties and movements, by the new type of entrepreneurs and lease operators.

Eduard Shevardnadze said that, from the very outset, the ideas was attacked by the press of a ceartain direction. "I wouldn't say that was in our way—it's useful to have an organized counter- force. But, there are blatant attempts to discredit Aleksandr Yakovlev, me, and some other suporters of forming a new party." It's to be expected, though, said Shevardnadze, that new things are born in pain and difficulties, we have to be ready for that.

In conclusion, Shevardnadze stressed that "We have no intention to make enemies or provoke conflicts. We wish to create a normal situation, to take the country out of the crisis, and to save democracy".

Union, Republic Foreign Ministers Meet

Discuss Chernobyl

LD2906065191 Mosow TASS International Service in Russian 1900 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Minsk, 28 Jun (TASS)—The third meeting of the council of foreign ministers of the USSR and Union republics took place in the capital of Belorussia today.

The meeting focused on seeking ways for the USSR and the republics to make more active efforts in the international arena, specifically within the framework of the United Nations and its specialized bodies, in order to minimize the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station. The ministers agreed that the main attention should be paid to providing broad international support to the implementation of specific projects, so that this support is drawn as close as possible to the interests of every resident of Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Russia who suffered as a result of the accident.

In this connection, the significance of the forthcoming UN conference on announcing voluntary donations for the purposes of international cooperation in resolving the problems of Chernobyl was emphasized. The ministers agreed on joint actions to ensure that the conference is effective.

And understanding was reached that the USSR delegation and those of the republics will pursue a coordinated line on Chernobyl issue at the Economic and Social Council and UN General Assembly sessions, as well as other international forums.

In a special declaration on the issue, adopted at the meeting, the ministers expressed their hope that the world community will respond to the call by the UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar to give generous and long-term aid to the victims of the disaster.

Questions of further improvement of interaction between the USSR Foreign Ministry and those of the Union republics to provide consular services for external connections were discussed at the meeting. A mutually useful exchange of opinions took place on practical measures for the implementation of the republics' sovereign rights in the consular sphere.

The ministers outlined further steps toward deeper cooperation between the USSR Foreign Ministry and the foreign ministries of the Union republics, and toward expanding the scope of their joint actions in the international arena.

Bessmertnykh Interviewed

LD3006064991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0230 GMT 30 Jun 91

[Text] As we have already reported, a conference of the council of foreign ministers of the USSR and the sovereign republics took place in Minsk and lasted for two

days. At the end of the conference, a news conference was held. Our diplomatic correspondent, Viktor Levin, gives his account of the news conference:

[Begin recording] [Levin] USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, chairman of the council, gave an integral assessment of the conference. He stressed that the main problem discussed by the ministers—the issue of organizing international aid for those who have suffered from the Chernobyl disaster—will constantly remain the center of attention of diplomatic services of the Union and the republics. The minister said that the participants in the conference decided to double, triple, even increase by 10 times their efforts in organizing aid for the victims. Bessmertnykh voiced the opinion that the aid to those who have suffered from the Chernobyl disaster is, among other things, a test of the international community's readiness to lend a hand to people who are in trouble.

At the same time, as both Bessmertnykh and Russian Federation Foreign Minister Kozyrev pointed out, our own internal programs must also be made more active. Many resolutions are being adopted, but their effectiveness is small, almost negligible.

The second issue discussed at the conference concerned the cooperation between the Union Foreign Ministry and those of the republics in the field of consular activity. Bessmertnykh said this extremely important and labor-intensive sphere of work is being increasingly handed over to the republics' jurisdiction.

Questions from journalists—and it was mainly the Belorussian media represented there—concerned various details of the aid to the Chernobyl disaster victims. However, one question was asked, the significance of which, to my mind, goes far beyond a purely local interest. A new newspaper, BELARUS, one of our Minsk colleagues said, recently published an article in which the opinion was expressed that, allegedly, Belorussia would actually benefit if it left the United Nations, since it could thereby save $10 million per year, which is the sum of its membership dues. What do you think, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, the journalist asked. Here is the answer given by the USSR foreign minister:

[Bessmertnykh] Unfortunately, I must admit that I totally disagree with this initiative. I would like to be able to agree with a newspaper that has only just begun to exist. But, as you know, not everything can be counted in cash terms in this interconnected world of ours. How can you evaluate the role of Belorussia in the peacemaking process? What is its worth? It may be worth a thousand times more than the membership dues that it pays. What does Belorussia gain by being a permanent member of the United Nations? I think that Belorussia, like the Ukraine, which became member of the United Nations—moreover, a founding member of the United Nations—by their participation, has created a new world in which we are starting to live now. Can you translate this into monetary terms? I do not know. When some events happen far from our borders, including the Belorussian border or the Ukrainian border, such as in the Gulf, the Near East, or somewhere else, and when the United Nations intervenes, thanks to our agreement on this, and takes certain peacemaking measures or brings in forces concerned with pacifying conflicts or solves regional conflicts, is it good for Belorussia or bad? I think it is good. The world is interconnected, security is interconnected. There can be no zone in this quite small world of ours that is not covered by a single system of tangible security. If there is a breakdown somewhere, it is bad for the Soviet Union, for Belorussia, and for the Ukraine. It is impossible to count this. I think that the dues that Belorussia, the Ukraine, and the Soviet Union are paying reflect the weight of these states in the world community. They reflect the weight of important, I would say, large powers that are playing a major positive role. The world gains a lot from this. It is impossible to ask how we profit from this. Of course, this is quite a legitimate question in a market economy. However, it is not always so in world politics. [end recording]

Internal Affairs Ministers Discuss Crime

LD2806082891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1840 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] As you know, crime does not recognize national borders. That is why, at the present time, on the threshold of the signing of the Union treaty and in conditions of the strengthening sovereignty of Union republics, questions relating to consolidation of the forces of law and order and preservation of the integrity of the system of Internal Affairs bodies as a key guarantee of the country's security are becoming particularly acute.

A most important landmark in tackling these problems was a conference of leaders of internal affairs ministries of Union republics at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. [video shows USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Pugo and other participants]

[Unidentified corrspondent] The matters being discussed at this conference were very weighty—namely, the increased aggressiveness and brutality of the criminal world and the spread of criminal terrorism, corruption, and organized crime. This is being aggravated by the interethnic conflicts that have caused many human casualties and the total collapse of the economy in many areas. Undoubtedly in such conditions the question of the need for a unified internal affairs system remains one of the main themes. [video shows interview with B.K. Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, by unidentified correspodent]

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Boris Karlovich, this is already the second gathering this year at the level of internal affairs ministers of Union republics. None of the representatives of the ministries declined to take part in the meeting. Can nothing be done by the professionals?

[Pugo] Yes, it is very important that representatives of all the Union republics are taking part in this meeting of internal affairs ministers of the Union republics. This is a very good thing, because we know that there is not at present such unity in all sectors of the national economy or structures for governing our country. It is very important for everyone now to realize just how great is the danger now presented by organized crime—in particular corruption and the mafia which has infiltrated a number of our state institutions. All of this constitutes a great threat. We must all work together to prevent the further growth of these dangerous phenomena in our society.

[Correspondent] And a further question. How does this meeting relate to the coming signing of the Union treaty?

[Pugo] Really, all of the discussion today has been proceeding under the shadow of the draft Union treaty. We cannot conceive that the work of the Ministry of Internal Affairs' system could be organized without account being taken of the new Union treaty. The work will stem from the functions that the republics hand over to the center, and the system as a whole must of necessity take account of those sovereignties that have been proclaimed by the republics. It is necessary to organize our work in line with the realities of the present day. [video cuts to show next interviewee, V.P. Barannikov Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic minister of internal affairs]

[Barannikov] Our main task at present is to preserve the Union and to preserve the unity of the system of internal affairs bodies. The fact is that crime is migrating to such an extent and it is so multifaceted that it requires unity on the part of all internal affairs bodies. [video cuts to show next interviewee, A.V. Vasilishin, Ukrainian minister of internal affairs]

[Vasilishin] We believe that there should be such meetings [as this one] on a monthly basis, because a number of matters arise and it would be possible simply to remove some tension or other or else deal immediately here on the spot with an unclear issue. [video cuts to show next interviewee, F.SH. Kulov, minister of internal affairs of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan]

[Kulov] When they have come to us, say, from the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Russia we have tried to extend the maximum assistance right up to even having a comradely social get-together. Well, is one to conceal that fact? Professionals can always find a common language. It is this professional cooperation that I think it is important at present to preserve, because at present in these uneasy times the only force that can in general guarantee people security is the internal affairs ministries. I do not see any other such force. [video cuts to show next interviewee, A.V. Vaznis, minister of internal afairs of the Latvian Republic]

[Vaznis] The problems that everyone has are by no means identical. For example, the positions of the Baltic republics and Moldavia are very different from the Central Asian republics. So our interests do not always coincide.

[Correspondent] But does one nevertheless need to strive for cooperation?

[Vaznis] It is necessary not only to strive but also to cooperate, and we are in favor of cooperating without exception with all the republics while taking account, of course, of our mutual interests. [end recording]

[Correspondent] The outcome of the meeting was a protocol which was signed by the leaders of the internal affairs ministries of all the republics.

Constitution Compliance Committee News Conference

LD2806224591 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—"The Soviet Constitutional Compliance Committee accepted for consideration, at the request of the federal parliament, the draft Union treaty and will give its conclusion on legal matters, connected with it, in the first decade of July," chairman of the Constitutional Compliance Committee Sergei Alekseyev said at a press conference here today.

He believes that the procrastination of the analysis of the draft document in the republics, for instance, the postponement of the adoption of a final decision on it by the Ukrainian parliament, might turn the signing of the new Union treaty into a long process.

Responding to a TASS question, Deputy Chairman of the Constitutional Compliance Committee Boris Lazarev said that, according to the law, the mechanism of signing the Union treaty should be as follows: "It should be signed by official delegations, elected by republican parliaments, since it is the republics that are renewing the federation. But federal authorities should not be removed from this process, because the Union does exist today, and continuity should be observed. Together with the Soviet parliament, perhaps the USSR Congress of People's Deputies will express its attitude to the treaty."

Lazarev recalled that since the Union treaty would have a greater legal force than the Constitution (according to the draft treaty, a new constitution should be worked out on its basis), the present USSR Congress of People's Deputies will have to adopt a new constitution of the country and a new legislative authority, the Supreme Soviet, after the signing of the treaty. Alekseyev added that presidential elections should be held after it.

Alekseyev said at the press conference that the Constitutional Compliance Committee had examined recently the fact of granting additional powers to the president to issue decrees having the force of laws. "We pointed to the need for being very careful with the practice of delegating legislative powers to executive authorities,

because this can lead to the erosion of these two institutions," he said. Alekseyev recalled that a similar situation had formed last week, when Prime Minister Pavlov had also asked to grant additional powers to him.

"We insist that all matters dealing with the delegation of powers should be made absolutely clear in the new constitution," Alekseyev said.

Gorbachev Chairs CPSU Draft Program Meeting

LD2806185691 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—A regular session of the commission for working out a draft programme of the Soviet Communist Party was held today. It was chaired by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. The session discussed the version of the programme submitted by the working group of the commission. Rank-and-file party members and representatives of various trends and platforms in the party took part in the discussion.

A report on the session of the commission will be circulated.

Gorbachev Message to Red Cross, Crescent Congress

PM2806153791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1

[President M.S. Gorbachev message "To the Delegates and Guests of the 11th Congress of the Union of USSR Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies"; date not given]

[Text] Cordial greetings to the participants in the 11th all-Union Congress of the Union of USSR Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

Sincere gratitude should be expressed and a good word said for the 125-year traditions and selfless activity of the Soviet and international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement in spreading the ideals of peace, humanity, and charity, easing suffering, and protecting people's lives, health, and dignity. The efforts of the society and its members in giving assistance to the victims of earthquakes and other natural disasters and the constant support for aged citizens living alone, invalids, and war and labor veterans will not be forgotten. The society's contribution to easing tension in interethnic relations is of particular value in our difficult times.

The humanitarian activity of the Soviet Red Cross and Red Crescent always have had and will continue to enjoy the state's support and assistance. I wish the congress success and its participants and all members of the USSR Red Cross and Red Crescent societies good health and prosperity.

USSR President M. Gorbachev.

2d Congress of Soviet Republican Party Opens

LD2806234191 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—The second congress of the Soviet Republican Party opened in Moscow on Friday.

The congress is being attended by 144 delegates from various Soviet regions.

The congress was addressed by newly elected Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov who called for forming a new democratic party to unite reform-minded peopled from various political parties and movements, the Russian TV Vesti programme reports.

Yakovlev Responds to Newspaper Reports

PM2806171391 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 29 Jun 91 p 1

[Unattributed RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA report followed by statement by A. Yakovlev under the heading: "A.N. Yakovlev Statement Regarding..."]

[Text] Yesterday RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA printed a brief commentary headlined "Who Is Provoking a Split." It discussed all manner of rumors (frequently contradictory) that are being earnestly circulated lately by various mass media, including foreign mass media, regarding a number of well-known Communists, particularly senior USSR presidential adviser A. Yakovlev. They are trying to make these people out to be splittists at someone's "prompting."

In turn, one newspaper cited a Japanese YOMIURI SHIMBUN report: It was said that Yakovlev would officially declare that he was leaving the CPSU on Wednesday 26 June. On Thursday 27 June, another newspaper carried an INTERFAX report with a statement allegedly by Aleksandr Nikolayevich himself, saying in particular that "all's fair in politics." There have also been other articles.

In response to a RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent's question as to whether Aleksandr Nikolayevich had said that he was leaving the CPSU as TRUD, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA had reported, he replied that he had written a statement regarding those articles. As promised, today we print this statement from A. Yakovlev:

"I made no such categorical statements to INTERFAX, much less official statements. I simply answered the question by saying that I did not know YOMIURI SHIMBUN's sources. That is all.

"I will add today that I did receive an unofficial report back in March (and also over the past few days) that the CPSU Central Control Commission intends to investigate my sociopolitical activity and even expel me from

the party. But it seems that they are unable to think up a way to formulate it. Let them think about it.

"As for the crux of the matter, I reserve the right to make the necessary decision, particularly under conditions of continuing organized persecution, out-and-out abuse, falsehood, and brutish spite, above all in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

"I will act as my conscience dictates."

[Signed] A. Yakoviev.

Government, Media View Information Policy

LD2706100291 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—Soviet officials working in other countries, heads of Soviet ministries, departments and organisations, as well as representatives of Soviet republics and the mass media have attended a two-day meeting at the Soviet Foreign Ministry to discuss information work in other countries.

Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy said that information work and especially on the international arena have been reoriented due to perestroyka in the Soviet Union and transcended the limits of traditional views and outdated standards.

He stressed the need to stop using complimentary information as regards the Soviet Union and biased information as regards other ways of life. He said public opinion becomes increasingly important in this situation.

Since information helps make international relations more humane, it should be oriented to people, their well-being and prosperity. Therefore, comprehensive information coverage of a CSCE meeting to be held in Moscow on September 10 is of prime importance, Petrovskiy said.

MOSCOW NEWS Questions OMON Role, Aims

PM2806143691 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 23, 9-16 Jun 91 p 6

[Article by Len Karpinskiy: "The System's Storm Troopers"]

[Text] Indeed, what is OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment]? Prompted by growing concern, rather than just idle curiosity, more and more people are asking this question. What is the "special task" of these notorious military detachments? Who are they subordinate to? Formally a branch of the law-enforcement bodies, they do not seem to abide by any known laws. In fact, these military men dressed in bush jackets flaunt the law at every step.

If OMON-style formations intruded into a neighbouring sovereign country, they would be regarded as occupants and repelled in the same fashion as Saddam Husayn's army was. In our case, the object of aggression is not a foreign country, but our own. Our totalitarian state has for decades behaved as an occupying force in its country, and OMON is its ugly offspring.

Doesn't that explain why the Supreme Soviet, so long on appeals to build a law-governed society, has never bothered to look into OMON's activities? Or why the Supreme Soviet chairman was so indifferent to what participants from the U.S., Britain, Norway and Japan at the First International Sakharov Congress had to tell him after their trip to the Armenian-Azerbaijanian border. Although their accounts pointed to outrageous violations of human rights, civilian deaths, not to say instances of people being beaten up and tortured. The Lithuanian and Latvian parliaments, enraged by the destruction of customs stations by OMON, sent notes of protest to the USSR Supreme Soviet and to the Soviet President—but received no reply.

So far nobody claims responsibility for OMON's actions. And this only adds to our woes. If the OMON detachments act on their own and obey nobody, why not disarm and disband them? If they are carrying out someone's orders, then who are they subordinate to and why are these people not known? Desperate tales about OMON only aggravate the feeling of anxiety.

Not long ago Lieutenant-General Griyenko, chief of the Military and Political Administration and first deputy commander of the Interior Ministry internal forces, complained in Pravda that some "pseudo-democratic" periodicals publish "slander and allegations" against the internal forces. The General offers his own version. In his view "authorities in the Republic (of Armenia—Ed.) themselves drove its people into a deadend. Life became unbearable, and people started to think and make their own decisions. How could they continue to live, to raise children and till the land?" As a result, the internal forces "were asked by the village elders to help them move to a new place and ensure their security".

The security was ensured—in the best traditions of the Cheka during the civil war: hostages, disfigured faces, threats to raze the villages to the ground.

An assessment of OMON's activities by criminal investigator Lieutenant-Colonel Volobuyev seems to have come closest to the truth: "The repressive machine is used by the bureaucratic system not so much to enforce law and order as to protect the interests of the ruling government structures." One can add to this that OMON perfoms the role of storm troopers of that system. This is what one must expect from decaying government structures and their spasmodic attempts to try to remain in power. They preach peace and order, but create chaos instead. They condemn "a war of laws", but do everything to escalate it.

There are three circumstances which confirm the above observations. First. The state military formations called upon to guard the country's security and citizens' rights often appear as a regular gang of bandits, and pose a real threat to people. Second. Acts of violence are mostly

staged in those republics which have azdvanced farthest along the road to independence. Third. The official motivations behind acts of terrorism on the Armenian-Azerbaijanian border, as well as in Lithuania and Latvia, sharply contrast with the facts—be it the tragic events in Tbilisi, paratroopers' alleged hunt for draft dodgers in Vilnius, or the occupation of Baku.

Bovin Berates Critics of Shevardnadze Legacy

PM2806162591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Union Edition p 10

["Political Commentator's Opinion" by Aleksandr Bovin: "Voice of the Past"]

[Text] Criticism of the Soviet government's foreign policy began to intensify beginning roughly last spring. As a rule, it is "Shevardnadze's policy" or "the Shevardnadze line" that is formally criticized. But essentially this has meant, and means, the foreign policy which as a whole is associated with perestroyka, the initiatives of M.S. Gorbachev, and the concept of new political thinking that he proposed. Evidently it is considered somehow "easier" and "simpler" to convict a former minister of all mortal sins than an acting president. Man is weak...

Among recent material the article by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Krasnov and Yu. Nikolayev, a member of the Russian Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium, "On the Swings in the 'New Thinking.' Former Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's Stance" (SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 15 June 1991) is distinguished by the broadest critical sweep. In itself the article is uninteresting: It contains no independent ideas or interpretations. But it does deserve attention and analysis as a kind of resume, a setting out of grievances against the main architects of the USSR's current foreign policy course—Gorbachev, Shevardnadze, and Yakovlev. It deserves attention and analysis also because it expresses the mood of a significant section of our society, the section which still mourns for the past and is not reconciled to the need for a radical restructuring not only of domestic, but also foreign policy.

A. Krasnov and Yu. Nikolayev propose counting up the number of "bloopers [tsyplyata] in our foreign policy activity" in the period in which E. Shevardnadze occupied the minister's apartments on Smolensk Square.

They counted them up—and shed a few tears.

In the last five years the USSR, formerly a great power, has become "a second-rate country, and not only under the influence of internal causes." Our state "has lost its allies, both those which were bound to us by treaty obligations and those which were intimately close to us in sympathies and adherence to common ideals." And yet another emotive phrase: "The catastrophe which has hit the USSR in foreign relations is equal in all its parameters to the consequences of defeat in World War III—which, fortunately, has not taken place."

I understand the emotions which overwhelm the writers. They feel great pain for the state. Therefore I will not define the scale of the exaggeration but will put the question point-blank: What has foreign policy got to do with this? Or put it another way: Just what "blunders" or "mistakes" by Gorbachev or Shevardnadze have caused the collapse of the socialist commonwealth and its institutions (the Warsaw Pact and CEMA) and the marked reorientation of socialist-oriented countries toward capitalism?

It is somehow awkward even to explain that the fundamental processes in question are a consequence of the fact that the socialist experiment began in 1917 was not crowned with success. This is the source of all the "bloopers." They—like our perestroyka—were caused by the universal crisis in socialism. We have been left without allies by no means because our foreign policy disgraced itself, but because a mass protest against the totalitarianism which we imposed and which was identified with us broke through all the political safeguards and raised a wave of revolutionary, democratic transformations in East Europe.

Only in one case could foreign policy have become actively involved in the situation. If the Ministry of Defense had "helped out" the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, if it had unleashed force—military force—in order to stifle the impulse toward freedom and install the people we wanted everywhere. The "allies" would have remained. And CEMA would remain. But at what price? The annulment of detente, a new Cold War period, another twist to the arms spiral. And, naturally, the collapse of perestroyka.

Our leaders had the intelligence and the courage not to take this, alas (!), traditional route, to avoid a new shame and confirm their loyalty to one of the most important principles of the new political thinking—every people has the freedom to choose its own destiny. Incidentally, this applies to Lithuanians or Georgians no less than to Poles or Bulgarians.

But let us return to the "ex-minister" and his critics.

Diplomacy, of course, is the more effective, the firmer the home front from which it derives its support. Shevardnadze was unlucky. He did not have such a home front. True, he did have missiles. But, after all, that is not everything. There was no firm, smoothly functioning economy; there was no well-adjusted political mechanism of power and administration. There was no national consensus on the principal questions of the country's existence. Nevertheless the minister managed to maintain the reputation of a great power, to speak so that people listened to him, and to defend, argue for, and implement Soviet initiatives.

On the subject of these initiatives, on at least some of them the two critics clearly have their own opinion. It goes like this: "While the Americans were resolving their national imperatives in Libya, Panama, and Iraq by

traditional means, we were clowning around with slogans about deideologization, worldwide nuclear castration, 'the European home,' and so forth, which no one took seriously." Judging by the internal logic of this sentence, the two writers would have preferred a different scenario: We should have resolved our imperatives in East Europe by "traditional means" and the Americans could have amused themselves with slogans. In general, we should have "hit out," but the "ex-minister," as already explained, "clowned around."

Once again elementary things have to be explained.

About deideologization. An ideology as a system of philosophical guidelines for one social group or another can not be deideologized. And no one is trying to do this, except for some smart lecturers and over-reconstructed professors. The new political thinking claims that in the framework of international relations it is expedient to move state and national interests to the foreground, and not ideological, philosophical aims. These aims have not disappeared, but they have somehow gone into parentheses in everyday foreign policy activity. And hardly anyone will argue with this.

About "nuclear castration." The two writers have in mind the Soviet plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Serious politicians have indeed taken it "seriously." After all, the important thing here is not deadlines, tempos, or other specific details—they can change within the broad compass. Here it is the design, the idea, the long-term prospect that is important. The impetus for endeavors is important. It is possible that computations will show the inner instability of the zero level. Then—and science is already tackling this—we should examine the different options for mini-nuclear [miniyadernyye] levels in order to choose the one that is the most stable.

About the "European home." A conference of the foreign ministers of the states involved in the Helsinki process has just ended in Berlin. The various ideas and various concepts being compared and studied include European building. And confederation. And a transatlantic community. And a European home. Perhaps the two critics have their own information sources, but those in my possession in no way endorse their claim that no one has taken our European ideas seriously.

The next target of critical darts is designated as follows: It was not enough for the ex-minister to leave the country without allies; he placed in question our state's "territorial integrity." What do they mean? The fact, it transpires, that E. Shevardnadze did not refute A.N. Yakovlev's thesis about secret Soviet-German protocols, and that these protocols should be recognized as invalid from the outset. A. Krasnov and Yu. Nikolayevich describe the corresponding decision of the "stunned" Congress of People's Deputies as "laying the juridical basis for the dismemberment of the state."

Let us examine the two writers' rationale on the factual and legal planes. The facts are as follows: No one has managed to uncover the original of the 1939 Soviet-German protocols, either in the German or in the Soviet archives. But, first, photocopies exist of these documents whose authenticity has been confirmed by all the available means. And, second, diplomatic correspondence between Moscow and Berlin contains numerous references to the protocols and their contents. Yakovlev's report only confirmed, some decades late, what the entire political and academic world knew long ago.

As for the "juridical basis" for the secession of the Baltic republics, this cannot be created by an act so historically fortuitous as the Soviet-German protocols. Recognition of these protocols as invalid and as juridically null and void from the moment they were signed can be used to deny the lawfulness and juridical propriety of the Soviet Union's annexation of the Baltic States. But, let us allow, this can be disputed. An incontestable juridical basis for the republics' secession from the USSR is the right of every nation to self-determination, up to and including the formation of an independent state. This idea was contained even in the USSR Constitution of 1936. So that grievances should be addressed not to A. Yakovlev or E.A. Shevardnadze, but to "the man himself," J. Stalin.

The two critics evidently feel that in raising their critical exercises to a high theoretical plane they lose out in persuasiveness. Turning to practice, they inform readers that an "unbearable itch" for quick reports of yet more victories prompted E.A. Shevardnadze to look for success "at the cost of surrendering positions, concessions, and sometimes even downright capitulation..." And in order to cover up this "political ducking and weaving," the "hazy, muddled" category of "new thinking" was used, which meant "renunciation of national interests."

Let us begin to unravel this tangle of "arguments" from the end. The two writers' claims about renunciation of national interests can hardly be justified by the sources. Rather the contrary. As has already been mentioned above, the new political thinking, seeking to limit the influence of ideological motives on foreign policy activity, emphasizes the significance of state and national interests. And, so far as I can judge, E. Shevardnadze was a fervent supporter of such an approach.

Let us ask what a state interest is. What does it require? Obviously it requires the creation of favorable foreign policy conditions for the free development of the state and society in question. State interest includes a sufficient level of state security and the absence of marked threats from outside; active, mutually advantageous economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation; and the creation of an attractive "image" for the state in question, the maintenance of its prestige and influence.

Applied to our times, state interest requires the creation and support of an international situation favorable to perestroyka and the profound transformation of Soviet society. So then, what? Is it possible, remaining in the realm of common sense, to claim that for the last five

years the Soviet diplomatic services have been operating against the USSR's state interest? In my opinion, no. Our diplomacy has not only solved the minimum task, seeing that no one stops us from engaging in perestroyka, but has also done much to solve the maximum task of getting others to help us carry out perestroyka.

To conclude the topic of state interests I want to make one substantial qualification. In defending your own state interest it is desirable always to remember your partners' state interests. Selfishness is counterproductive in the final analysis. If you want to have friends, be one yourself. To concede certainly does not mean to retreat. Policy suffocates without compromise. And it is in the last five years that Soviet diplomacy, not without making mistakes, has begun to assert the difficult art of maneuvering, foregoing all ultimatums, and combining firmness with flexibility.

It is these marks of diplomacy that are interpreted by Shevardnadze's critics as surrendering positions, or even capitulation. Look, they tell us, the Americans have categorically refused the USSR's demand that naval forces be included on the negotiations agenda. And Shevardnadze, forgetting national interests, compelled our military to agree to the Americans' position.

I will not go into why the Navy has such a different significance for the United States and the USSR. Let us look at the problem from another angle. How should the Americans be answered? By giving up disarmament negotiations altogether (all or nothing)? By refusing (in retaliation) to reduce another type of armed forces, the Air Force, let us say? I doubt it... Because neither of these options corresponds to the USSR's interests.

The two writers recalled the aircraft carriers. The "ex-minister"—and not he alone—was indeed against their construction and deployment. Because it would be a debilitating, almost unsupportable burden for our national economy. Because, furthermore, in certain circumstances difficulties could arise in getting them out of the Black Sea (the dockyard is in Nikolayev). Because, finally, the functions of aircraft carriers and aircraft carrier groups (protection of extended naval communications, support of offensive operations in regions remote from the home country, and so forth) go beyond the scope of the main tasks faced by the Soviet Navy.

The "single conclusion" of the two critics on the whole bloc of disarmament questions is formulated as follows: The United States has not made concessions on a single class of arms where it has a superiority; all the concessions have been made by the USSR in the classes and types of weapons where it had a superiority."

A serious charge. But let us look closer. The basic concept of the disarmament process is parity, a balanced correlation of weapons on both sides, that is to say, their approximate equality taking account of quantitative and qualitative parameters. The real content of parity can be clarified in the course of disarmament talks, and—most important!—parity is reproduced at progressively lower levels. In practice this means unequal reductions. Seeing we had twice as many intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, we destroyed twice as many (and for the same reason we destroyed 3.5 times more warheads). We have, for example, 308 of the extremely heavy SS-18 missiles. The Americans have none. We reduced ours by a half. And the Americans compensate for the superiority we have conserved in this type of missile by their superiority in other types of carriers. And so on, and so forth. The picture is fairly complex, but not beyond the reach of understanding.

Both the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense defend the country's interests. But in both places there exist what are called "departmental interests." This is inevitable. Therefore debates and clashes of opinions and positions are also inevitable. Inevitable, and useful. The interaction of various viewpoints produces a stereoscopic view of a problem. But does this justify writing about E. Shevardnadze's "confrontational rivalry" with his colleagues in the country's leadership, and the "ex-minister's" personal antipathy for his military comrades? Evidently the two writers have observed events at close hand. I did not have that opportunity. But I think that E. Shevardnadze is too intelligent to transpose business contacts into the sphere of personal relations.

Following A. Krasnov and Yu. Nikolayev I have had to touch on a wide spectrum of topics. Probably I have not been accurate in all places. I have had to omit a number of important details. I have not always shown sufficient depth. And this is what I think. Has the time not come to launch a public discussion of the key factors in our foreign policy and national security problems? With the participation, of course, of professionals, specialists, and experts from all the interested departments. The period we are living through is a complex and a transitional one, and an open, qualified—not bureaucratic [apparatnyy]—discussion would help to map out the aims and means of foreign policy activity.

To sum up. The two writers have posed an extremely substantive question: What have been the results of Soviet foreign policy in the years of perestroyka? Their answer is unambiguous: The results are catastrophic. We have already explained that foreign policy has had virtually nothing to do with the indicated "catastrophe": At work here was the profound, universal crisis of socialism. As for strictly foreign policy problematics, the two critics, once they started counting "bloopers," were duty-bound to ask themselves: Has the Soviet Union's security grown weaker or stronger in the last five years? Has the threat of war intensified or been reduced? According to my notions the threat of war has manifestly decreased, and, correspondingly, our country's security has grown stronger. Not because we have more missiles, divisions, or aircraft carriers. But because other people have ceased (or are ceasing) to fear us and have begun to treat us with far less suspicion than previously. Because

we have switched from portentous declarations to practical disarmament steps. Because we have left Afghanistan, and there are no more Afghanistans in the offing. People have begun to view us without their earlier alarm, and we have become less anxious ourselves. That's the way it is, if we count up the real achievements...

At the same time, it is a truism to say that there are omissions, mistakes, or false approaches in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' work. But to reject the conceptual fundamentals of Soviet foreign policy, to annul at a stroke virtually everything that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has done in the last five years means either to completely fail to understand the new foreign policy strategy, or—more likely—to completely reject it.

And a last point. The impression arises that A. Krasnov and Yu. Nikolayev are concerned not so much with critical examination of our foreign policy or analysis of the "ex-minister's" stance as with the desire to wound, offend, and insult this man.

They did not mince words. E. Shevardnadze came into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs without a concept and not possessing the personal qualities of a diplomat—endurance, patience, and stubbornness; his characteristic traits were a predilection for phrasemongering and a peremptory manner; his actions sowed the seeds of retreat and collapse; he was a political fop, a political chameleon; he just smoothed out others' rough edges; he showed flagrant contempt for his Motherland; and, of course, there are hints of hefty dollar royalties.

I am not personally acquainted with the two writers. I do not know them. I have no idea about their moral qualities. But I have been dealing with writers and articles for a long time—a very long time. There is a simple dependence: Show me what you have written, and I will tell you who you are. Smothering their victim in generous helpings of epithets and lurid descriptions, our authorial repository—the doctor and the [Presidium] member—have essentially been fashioning their own image. I have long been seeking the word to unlock, so to speak, this image. I think I have found it—baseness. Yes, baseness.

Problems in Press Distribution Considered

PM2806155591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by S. Oganyan: "The Retail Trade and Price Differentials. Why PRAVDA Is By No Means Available in All Kiosks"]

[Text] "The Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter [Soyuzpechat] summer offensive" was how one newspaper defined the ultimatum from the USSR Ministry of Communications for payment for its services in distributing publications in 1992. It basically boils down to a simple but clever idea: The Soyuzpechat plans to continue getting as much as possible out of the publications, while doing as little as possible.

And, as Deputy Minister Ye. Manyakin—whose name does not evoke very favorable associations in publishing circles—stated, postal tariffs during the year could quite easily change as prices change. He could have added that the only thing that will remain unchanged is the blatantly devil-may-care, arrogant attitude to the interests of publications and, correspondingly, their readers.

What is hard to understand is why the Soyuzpechat has this monstrous appetite. After all, as the communications workers themselves admit, aggregate print runs of newspapers throughout the country have not increased—they have just been redistributed. This means that they are not doing any more work, but that this work has just become more varied. And last year's rise in the price of postal services was hardly reflected in mailmen's pay... So why is the Soyuzpechat so shamelessly increasing the differential between the payment for services and the quality of those services, increasing the former and reducing the latter?

This is a rhetorical question. The answer is clear. The Soyuzpechat's hands have been untied and it is complacently rubbing them in anticipation of the golden rewards it will get from these large price differentials. Yes, thrilled about its limitless power over subscribers and publications, it could indeed completely ignore any limits.

And that is the situation, incidentally. Or almost the situation. In Ye. Manyakin's opinion, we are not living in a civilized state. Consequently, the Ministry of Communications is treating us according to the law. The law of the underworld. The only thing Ye. Manyakin fails to take into account is that this law is geared to destruction. After all, the Ministry of Communications, by forcing people into a dead end, is cutting off the branch on which it has been so victoriously perched. Clearly, this policy will inevitably lead to the destruction of newspapers and magazines—the very "cash cows" which the Ministry of Communications sees as an exceptionally reliable source of easy money. It is not as reliable as all that. In the very near future we will probably witness a prolonged series of bankruptcies.

I was recently able to put these views of mine to two more than competent officials—G. Frolov, chief of the Soyuzpechat's Central Retail and Subscription Agency, and his deputy, S. Angelina. But my reproaches went unanswered.

The fact is that the Ministry of Communications intends to rid itself of the Soyuzpechat. Since the agency's name includes the word "pechat" [press] the Ministry of Communications has clearly decided to transfer it to the USSR State Committee for the Press [Goskompechat]. It has to be said that the Ministry of Communications chose a very successful time to do this—the Soyuzpechat has today turned into a feeble invalid.

"This is a bad decision," G. Frolov said. "For the subscribers, for the publishers, and for us. We're intimately bound up with the Ministry of Communications.

If we leave, the postal service will immediately wash its hands of us—they will say that delivery and retail isn't their job. But then how could we maintain subscriptions? It will be impossible without the postal service."

I do not know if Ye. Manyakin has heard these plaintive words. But he ought to heed them. I realize that listening is harder than presenting publishers with ultimatums. Destroying things is not constructive.

Some 13 percent of kiosks in Moscow are empty. And for entirely understandable reasons—few people are attracted by the low pay. This, I would recall, was the reason behind last year's sharp increase in tariffs. But where did the money go? Mailmen got 30 [rubles], but kiosk attendants got nothing. Isn't this why Ye. Manyakin, having to all intents and purposes duped them, has secretly transferred the kiosk attendants to the Goskompechat and left it to worry about their pay?

I think it hardly worth explaining how all this will end. The picture familiar to each of us can just be supplemented. I phoned PRAVDA correspondent V. Gerasimov in Leningrad and inquired how things were there.

"The same as they are everywhere," my colleague said. "Readers today are increasingly turning to their usual periodical, where they can get quite objective information. But this morning the corner kiosk did not have LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, or PRAVDA on sale. There was a three-day-old CHAS PIK. Nor could I buy my newspaper at the subway station: because of the 'presidential' tax the automatic dispensers can not be modified. At the city Soyuzpechat office I was told that some 200 dispensers were out of action for this reason.

"Of course," V. Gerasimov went on, "this is not the only thing holding back the growth of the retail trade. A good half of all kiosks are generally closed because of a shortage of people. And where people are available there is a tendency to primarily sell the more expensive publications. Well, that's business: After all, kiosk attendants earn more from a one-ruble weekly publication than from a 10-kopek newspaper. The Leningrad City Soviet's decision to double taxi fares has also increased difficulties. Who will now be responsible for the increased transportation charges?

"There is more and more talk in Leningrad about the possibility of switching at least some kiosk attendants to new working conditions. Bypassing interregional agencies, they could enter into direct contractual relations with publishing houses and, depending on demand, could issue orders themselves. Of course, this is on condition that they sell current periodicals during a set time. But in their remaining 'free' time they can sell any other publications in order to earn more.

"Since the start of the year," V. Gerasimov stated in conclusion, "retail sales of PRAVDA have remained unchanged at 20,000 copies, which clearly lags behind the demand for the paper."

It is a fact that there are not enough copies of PRAVDA in the kiosks. Whatever kiosk attendants' attitudes to our newspaper may be, all of them—or at least those with whom I talked—believe that they could sell at least twice the number they themselves are ordering. And yet they are not planning to increase their orders. The reason is very simple: The kiosk attendants are scared of risk. But their beloved Soyuzpechat is laying them open to risk. It only needs newspapers to be delivered an hour or so late for them to go unsold.

I was told this by the kiosk attendants who work at the busiest sites—outside the "Sokol," "Savelovskaya," and "Aeroport" subway stations, by the "Baykal" Movie Theater, and outside the Belorussia Station. But another thing that is interesting is that some of the most daring salespeople, despite the obvious risk, are prepared to double their PRAVDA order. But their initiative has not, shall we say, met with understanding at communications departments and centers. It is hard to say whether this is a question more of negative attitudes to PRAVDA or of plain inefficiency. But whichever is the case, it is virtually impossible to buy PRAVDA from a kiosk after 1000 hours. Just as, incidentally, it will be impossible to subscribe to it at communications departments starting from next month.

However, let's return to the problem of unsold newspapers. Many publishers are providing compensation for their cost, thereby getting the kiosk attendants out of financial straits. The PRAVDA Publishing House is not doing this as yet. But, according to Director V. Leontyev, it is prepared to do so provided that the publishing house has accurate information to hand...

This condition, as we can see, reflects the lack of confidence engendered by the Soyuzpechat's current actions. But, on the other hand, it indicates the definite funding constraints which even such a major publishing house as PRAVDA is experiencing. This, in particular, is why our publisher has an interest in all its newspapers being sold.

Abroad, admittedly, people have long since left this stereotype behind. It may never have existed there at all. They write off up to 40 percent of their newspapers, and they may even distribute them for free, because the bulk of their income—up to 75 percent—comes from advertising. The rich have their funny little ways.

Increasing retail sales is today a question for all publishers, including ours. What options are available? The most radical and seemingly inevitable option would be to create an alternative press distribution network. Undermining the Soyuzpechat monopoly and presenting it with real competition, an alternative network would probably force our current monopolists to work better and cure them of any desire to issue ultimatums.

For the time being, the situation is the same everywhere: The Soyuzpechat believes that the market is a way of making big money. The agency's workers see enterprise as a chance to take any steps to crank up prices without providing anything in return. Yes, the Soyuzpechat does have considerable difficulties of its own—there was a time when we would have discussed them sympathetically. But that is not the case today. Precisely because the Soyuzpechat is not only not attempting to seriously tackle its own problems, but is landing us—publishers, journalists, and readers—in them as well.

It makes you despair... But I am sure that we can not go on the way we are.

Deputy Takes Lukyanov to Court for Power Abuse

LD2606220591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1102 GMT 26 Jun 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The KURANTY newspaper reports that a case is being heard today at Moscow's municipal court which one could call: "USSR people's deputy versus chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet". Sergey Belozertsev, a young deputy from Karelia, who has gained popularity among the electorate for his sharply critical utterances against the strong of this world, has brought a case against Lukyanov himself, the speaker of the Union parliament. Belozertsev accuses Lukyanov of abuse of office, exceeding his authority and of persecuting for criticism and political beliefs.

'Social Benefit' of Nazarbayev Prestige Eyed

PM2806141991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[Albert Plutnik "Political Diary": "On the Social Benefit of Personal Prestige. Only With Broad Trust Is a Political Leader Capable Not Simply of Stating His Intentions But of Actually Influencing the Situation"]

[Text] I want to draw your attention to an event which has received quite scant and dull coverage in the press. I am talking about Kazakh President N.A. Nazarbayev's recent tour of his own region and his visit to the dusty and grimy worker cities of Karaganda, Temirtau, and Ekibastuz as they swelter in the June heat. About an apparently unremarkable event which outwardly is of purely local significance.

As an eyewitness to the meetings which took place during those days, however, I can attest that at least three of the meetings contained elements which gave them an importance extending beyond Kazakhstan. For example, there was the meeting at Karaganda's Kuzembayev mine where the republic leader gave an accountability report to the miners. First a few words about the background to it. Three months ago the country was rent by miners' strikes. The Kuzbass, the Donbass, and Vorkuta were on strike—but not Karaganda. Even though the miners' universal discontent at poverty and deprivation, which elsewhere had erupted from below ground in unstoppable gushers of despair and rebelliousness, had developed among people there, too.

Nazarbayev unhesitatingly put his reputation on the line—he gave a firm promise to do everything possible to help the miners. He then did what no one before him had seemed able to do in our country: On the strength of "Nazarbayev's word," the Karaganda miners decided not to strike. That extreme measure was deferred, thus giving the republic's leadership time to respond by actions to their demands as set out in a 16-point petition. And when the deadline was about the expire, Nazarbayev came to meet again with his compatriots—to report back on the steps taken. The sides, it seemed to me, were mutually satisfied not just with the work done but also its results. And the question of a strike disappeared of its own accord. It was good how the miners listened to the president—calmly, and with dignity; they did not gush with gratitude or show servile deference. Furthermore, Nazarbayev did not present what he had done as a noble deed, clearly aware of how excessive the duty of the "world's most humane" state is now toward each worker who has been subjected to decades of unparalleled exploitation.

Another episode of "all-union rank" was the conclusion of the "quadripartite communique" during a visit to Kazakhstan's Magnitka. The document, which bears not only the signature of the president—who, as a young man, was a furnaceman at this very combine—but also those of 42-year-old USSR Metallurgy Minister O. Soskovets, until recently director of the combine, USSR Coal Industry Minister M. Shchadov, a frequent visitor to Karaganda, where many of the sector's enterprises are located, and V. Shimko, USSR Radio Industry Minister, an infrequent visitor to these parts. His ministry has hardly any enterprises at all in this region. But that is how things are today. For the moment. The minister came here with an eye to the future. To establish contacts. To study market conditions. On the eve of the market and competition...

To cut a long story short, they did not meet for a routine discussion—on the limits of the republic's sovereignty, or the future of the union ministries. But to agree on how to live and work in conditions of the real exercise of republic sovereignty. With the transfer of enterprises to the republic's jurisdiction. The new reality means new relations. And there was Nazarbayev stating at the meeting: "To be honest, I did not think that the ministers would accept our proposals so readily."

Here is another episode from the trip—a brief talk, lasting just minutes, at an experimental agricultural enterprise in Karaganda Oblast in which Spanish businessmen who are cooperating with the republic's crop farmers expressed a readiness to substantially broaden the scale of their "Kazakh expansion." To involve in the collaboration new firms and additional—pretty considerable—hard currency resources, but on the essential

condition that the president himself is guarantor of the agreements to be concluded.

This is not the first time such a proposal has been put to Nazarbayev—nor even the 10th. It is not only our own Union departments which are seeking to gain a firm foothold on Kazakh soil nowadays but a large number of Western and Oriental firms. Eleven presidents of prominent U.S. corporations have visited Alma-Ata just in the recent past. A Saudi bank has opened in the Kazakh capital. British Petroleum, a well-known UK company, is actively seeking participation in oil refining. There are 11 Kazakh-Italian joint ventures in operation. That number will soon treble. Businessmen from Turkey, China, and South Korea are showing greater interest in business cooperation... Interesting ideas and more and more credits are being offered on "Nazarbayev's surety." Undoubtedly, the stable economic and political situation ensured by his leadership appeals to the business world. Foreign grants have been set up for young Kazakhs to take a management training course in the United States and South Korea in the near future. There are 40 grants. The number of would-be students is far higher. To avoid those situations so familiar to us all where competition winners are not decided at all by the contenders' abilities, Nazarbayev asked Prof. Beng [name as transliterated] of America, one of his foreign consultants, to examine the candidates.

So there you are, three brief extracts from a short trip united by a common theme: The social benefit of personal prestige. Indeed, all these episodes demonstrate how a leader's potential increases if he enjoys broad confidence. Only then is he capable not simply of stating his intention but of actually influencing a situation. Then his personal prestige becomes a material force—it is visible and has volume and weight.

A political prestige which has become a material force... Are there many people in our country today possessing such prestige? Substituting for Nazarbayev the main figures in our present-day sociopolitical life one by one, I tend to the view that few of them, faced with the great mass of miners, who are not cowed by the authorities, even less afraid of them, would be able to stop this creeping molten lava of the miners' discontent and divert it into the concrete channel of civil obedience.

All on Nazarbayev's word. On his guarantee... But how many times have we burned our fingers by placing exceptional confidence in exceptional individuals. Are we once more taking a risky gamble in wagering all on a "powerful individual"? Certainly not, of course—the gamble is on that policy which is linked in the republic, the country, and now the world with the name of a prestigious leader. What happens next? A policy is also a proper noun. Provided everyone understands that you cannot build in an individual region a life different from that in the rest of the country.

In politics an individual remains an individual whatever the policy. Even more so with the right policy. But what about the claims that it is not so much a question of people as of the system?

Recently I read comments by a government functionary which struck me by their erroneousness. He is convinced that if the general thrust of the changes taking place in society is correct, it doesn't matter so much what kind of people are leading the state. That their character, inclinations, nature, and intellectual potential are no longer of fundamental significance. It isn't people that matter but processes. The subjective factor does not simply give way to objective reality but seems to be absorbed by it.

It isn't people that matter but processes? Of course people matter!

Even the most correct idea can be distorted by a stupid and untalented executant.

In the chaotic atmosphere of our present daily lives, when a wry smile and skepticism have prevailed over confidence and hope, when many leaders continue to consider themselves leaders through force of habit alone because the people's faith in them, their programs, and their declarations has died and withered away, a fresh example—that of a prestige cherished and not squandered—is all the more attractive and striking. And when it is right there before your eyes, you understand more clearly that when we hope, for example, for a government of national accord enjoying from the very outset a universal sympathy and confidence, a government whose undisputed prestige could become a material strength, this is not just another attempt at reassuring ourselves or an illusion. Not the deception of a tortured and disordered consciousness toward which nations with a tragic history incline. But a quite realistic and fully realizable wish.

TASS Reviews 1 July PRAVDA

LD0107082291 Moscow TASS in English 0547 GMT 1 Jul 91

["PRAVDA Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—Today's PRAVDA carries President Mikhail Gorbachev's message of condolence to families of 32 miners, who died during a fire at the Yuznodonbasskaya-1 pit.

The newspaper reports a regular round of work in outer space by Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergei Krikalev. In contrast to previous exits from the Mir space station, when the crew was involved in repair work, this time the cosmonauts conducted scientific experiments.

PRAVDA comments on the economic situation in the country, trying to explain, why price increases have failed to ensure a sufficient amount of goods.

Commenting on the drop of production in the USSR, the newspaper writes that "unless republics and the centre reach stable political accord and all economic structures interact closely, it is impossible to take the economy out of crisis".

Writing about the work of Soviet parliamentary committees and commissions, PRAVDA focuses on debates on the draft new union treaty at the ethnic policy and inter-ethnic relations commission and the agrarian and food policy committee. They supported the draft as a whole, suggesting some amendments.

The newspaper writes that over the past week, it has received 2,050 letters from readers about the union's future, economic problems and the Soviet Communist Party's work. The newspaper notes that the party, if it wants to remain an influential force, has no right to avoid the struggle, which is still ahead.

The newspaper carries a report by the Soviet Defence Ministry that the Soviet Union on Sunday completed troop pullout from Czechoslovakia and Hungary in accordance with inter-governmental agreements.

Focusing on the situation in Yugoslavia, PRAVDA notes that "a unilateral move by Slovenia and Croatia, which declared their secession from the Yugoslav Federation, could explode the powder keg and lead to a civil war".

"The Soviet Union believes that the existence of a united and independent Yugoslavia is an important stability factor in the Balkans and in Europe as a whole," the newspaper notes that the "Baltic factor" has influenced events in Yugolavia.

In connection with the 70th anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party, PRAVDA writes about the party's history and today's life.

The Chinese Communist Party has "done away with old China's humiliating semi-colonial life, liquidated striking poverty and social inequality, led the country along the road of progressive economic development and made China a great country, which can set an example, PRAVDA writes.

The newspaper notes that "Moscow and Beijing maintain Sino-Soviet interaction within an optimum framework".

PRAVDA publishes a message of greetings from the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat to the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee in connection with the anniversary.

The newspaper reports on events in Gerat, Afghanistan, which call in question official reports that government forces "fully control" Gerat Province and "ensure residents' security". The newspaper writes that Afghan rebels have intensified attacks and shellings in the region.

TASS Reviews 29 June Soviet Central Press

LD2906075891 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 29 Jun 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—A regular meeting of the commission for the drafting of a new programme of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) was held on Friday under the chairmanship of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. A TASS report to this effect has been published by PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR).

Gorbachev on Friday met Bruce Rappoport, a major representative of the Western business world, who informed the president of the USSR of work together with Soviet partners and of his intentions to broaden and refine it, says a TASS report published in PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

President Gorbachev on Friday received Carlos Aldana, a member of the Secretariat of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, who is currently in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Commmittee.

In a frank and comradely atmosphere, Mikhail Gorbachev and Carlos Aldana considered principled matters concerning the development of Soviet-Cuban relations, according to a TASS report published in PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA runs a law of the Russian Federation "on the assumption of office by a president of the Russian Federation".

Newspapers announce that an extraordinary Congress of Russia's People's Deputies will open in Moscow on July 10.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA and SELSKAYA ZHIZN (RURAL LIFE) report that meetings and talks with representatives of some movements and platforms within the CPSU took place in the CPSU's Central Control Commission (CCC).

During the talks, speakers from CCC positions voiced serious concern over the fact that after the 28th Congress of the Party, individual groups and some Communists launched activities towards a revision of the basic principles of the collectively formulated policy of the CPSU.

Aleksandr Yakovlev, senior adviser to the president of the USSR, when asked by a RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent as to whether he had announced his withdrawal from the CPSU as had been reported in the press, said that he wrote a statement concerning reports about his alleged withdrawal from the Party. The statement is published in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. The same is reported by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

PRAVDA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA run a Soviet Foreign Ministry statement on the situation in Yugoslavia.

Viktor Shirokov, PRAVDA's political news analyst, comments on a draft treaty on a union of sovereign states, published on Thursday. Thereby the newspaper launches a discussion of the future treaty. The same subject is examined by Almira Kozhakhmetova, parliamentary analyst of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA.

Belorussian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich, PRAVDA writes, strongly criticised the USSR Cabinet of Ministers' resolution on organisational measures to work out production programmes for the socio-economic development of regions, republics, and the USSR as a whole for 1992 under conditions when market relations are in the making. In an interview with the newspaper, Kebich substantiates his stand.

"The Party and the working-class movement" is the headline under which RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA and SELSKAYA ZHIZN carry a report by the CPSU Central Committee's press centre from a regular meeting of the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reports that "a parliamentary commission considered the outcome of a Cabinet experiment at 'privatising' state property". The Cabinet of Ministers—and it is clearly seen from the example of country houses—is guided by the principle—he who used something, will now own it", the newspaper observes.

The same newspaper devotes a whole page to reports on the situation in Afghanistan.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN carries a charter of the USSR Farmers' Union, adopted on June 18, 1991, by the Union's constituent congress.

The causes of the growth of crime in the Soviet Union are analysed in articles in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Crimes by juvenile delinquents increased by 42 per cent over the period of 1986 to 1990, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA reports in particular.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes about the northern machine building amalgamation—the leading enterprise in Soviet nuclear-powered submarine construction.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries articles about little-known pages of the great patriotic war—a radio game between the Soviet counterintelligence service and the fascist Abwehr.

PRAVDA describes the activities of a Soviet intelligence network known in the West as the Red Capella.

Delegates of foreign business and political circles began to visit Kyrgyzstan more and more often of late, SELSKAYA ZHIZN writes. Why this is so is explained in an interview with the republic' prime minister Nasirdin Isanov.

PRAVDA tells about the new U.S ambassador to the USSR, Robert Strauss.

In their international news sections, newspapers report Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's stay in Austria and tragic developments in Yugoslavia.

PRAVDA carries an article by the newspaper's news analyst Vsevolod Ovchinnikov. The article headlined "the G-7, Perestroika and Tokyo" deals with the forthcoming Group of Seven summit in London and Japan's attitude with regard to assistance to reforms in the Soviet Union.

Economic

Yazov Notes 'Enormous Strain' Placed on Army

LD2806121091 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1112 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun—USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov pointed to the complex conditions in which the Army has to ensure the country's security. Speaking in Moscow at the all-Army Komsomol conference today, he noted that the half-million [troop] reduction of the Army and Navy, the implementation of the treaty of medium- and short-range missiles, the continuing withdrawal of troops from abroad, and the creation of a defense grouping of armed forces within the USSR borders "has brought enormous strain."

"The USSR armed forces are carrying out their main task—reliably ensuring the country's defense and security—while the military budget is steadily dwindling, and social and everyday problems are accumulating," Dmitriy Yazov said. He noted also the adoption of anti-constitutional acts on the issue of defense in a number of republics, and the fact that discrimination against servicemen and their families and a coordinated anti-Army campaign in the media have a negative effect on the life and actvity of the Army.

The USSR minister of defense said that the Army is suffering "tangible losses" in the ideological struggle for young people. He said that over the last two years, the number of Komsomol members among young soldiers has dropped by almost a half. Dmitriy Yazov put the blame for that on "destructive and nationalist-separatist forces" which, by lie and slander, discredit the Komsomol in order to deprive today's young people of leaders who can lead them. Having pointed to the need of "immediate and, to the highest degree, vigorous work," Dmitriy Yazov stressed that "one of the main sources of our fatherland's military glory, might, and the

invincibility of our Army" consists in "initiating young soldiers to the traditions of soldiers' friendship and military comradeship".

Addresses Young Communists

LD2806181291 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov pointed to the complicated present conditions under which the Army is called upon to ensure the country's security.

He was speaking at a conference of young communists serving in Soviet Armed Forces. Yazov told the conference that great efforts were demanded by the recent moves, including the reduction of Soviet Armed Forces by half-a-million, the fulfilment of the INF treaty, the continuing withdrawal of Soviet troops from other countries and the establishment of a defence armed force within the Soviet state borders.

"The Soviet Armed Forces have to accomplish their main task of ensuring the country's defence and security despite continuous cuts in the military budget and snowballing social and everyday problems," Yazov said.

He noted that the Soviet Armed Forces have had to withstand the negative impact of unconstitutional laws on defence promulgated in some republics, cases of discriminations against servicemen and their dependents and a coordinated anti-Army campaign launched by mass media.

The Soviet defence minister said the army has sustained considerable losses in the ideological struggle for the minds and hearts of the younger generation.

He said the number of young communists among conscripts has reduced nearly twice over the past two years. Yazov charged "destructive nationalist and separatist forces" with stepping up a campaign of lies and slander aimed at discrediting the Young Communist League and depriving the younger generation of its own leaders.

Yazov pointed to the need to make crucial vigorous efforts to ensure that young servicemen imbibe traditions of military friendship and army camaraderie, which have always served as one of the main sources of the country's military glory and the Army's might and invincibility.

Army Komsomol Rally Ends; Officials Elected

PM2806175591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Kovalev and Captain V. Popov report: "At First All-Army Komsomol Conference. Choice Made, Aims Determined"]

[Text] USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov addressed delegates at the morning sitting of the second day of the [First All-Army Komsomol] conference's work.

Discussion of the Programmatic Aims of the Armed Forces' Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Organization and its Statutes continued. There was no trace of the regulated unanimity of bygone times at Army Komsomol forums.

Amid an uncompromising "clash" of highly varied opinions and judgments ideological-political, educative, moral, and social priorities were defined in the life and activity of the Komsomol in uniform.

Delegates made their choice. Ideological unity based on the creative development of Marxist theory, Lenin's teaching on the defense of the socialist Fatherland, and the achievements of contemporary socialist thought.

The Army Komsomol's main aim is to consistently implement a state youth policy, create conditions for the all-around development of the young person, reveal his creative potential in the interests of military service, and rear a citizen and a patriot.

After electing the Komsomol Organization's central organs the delegates completed their work.

In-depth, all-around analysis of the results of the conference lies ahead. Even now this can be said to be a key, landmark event in the career of the Armed Forces' Komsomol.

On the same day the All-Army Council of Komsomol Organizations held a plenum. It elected the Bureau members, chairman, and deputy chairmen of the All-Army Council of Komsomol Organizations. Lieutenant Colonel Aleksey Reshetnikov was elected chairman.

Defense Cuts Hampering Space Research, Design

LD2906102291 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 29 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—It is difficult to dispute the need for conversion processes in the defence industry. But any programme, particulary such as conversion, must be thoroughly weighed and substantiated, general Igor Kurinnoy, head of the Soviet Defence Ministry's Military and Political Department for Space Research, told TASS.

"My attitude to conversion problems is varied," the general said. "By way of a general evaluation of the conversion process, I can say that the defence industry has lost much more than the economy has acquired.

"A military person cannot stay indifferent to a decline in the general potential of the industry that operated on the strength of orders placed by the Defence Ministry.

"Cuts in appropriations for the defence sector led to the termination or considerable slowdown in the pace of the implementation of a number of research and design projects that were being translated into reality through orders placed by the Defence Ministry. This also led to a decrease in orders for quantity-produced equipment. The under-capacity operation of defence-sector plants gives rise to rather negative processes.

"One should not forget that as of today the defence sector represents the cutting edge of the Soviet industry which has available the most up-to-date equipment, has created unique instruments and the most advanced technology," Kurinnoy said.

Speaking about space research sector conversion, the general said that a number of space systems being used by the Defence Ministry can be applied for civilian purposes.

It is essential to develop such dual-purpose systems on a share basis with those organisations that are interested in creating them. This will thereby obviate the need for the development of special spacecraft to accomplish purely civilian tasks, Kurinnoy said.

Air Defense Forces Status, Future Discussed

PM2806120191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[Account of roundtable discussion by Colonel A. Yurkin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA permanent correspondent for the Air Defense Forces, and Lieutenant Colonel O. Falichev, deputy editor of the Missile and Air Defense Forces Combat Training Desk, under the "'Roundtable': Military Reform and the Air Defense Forces" rubric: "Dynamics of Parity"]

[Text] We have already familiarized readers with some problems and development prospects of the Strategic Rocket Forces and the Ground Forces (the issues for 19 March and 18 April 1991). Today representatives of the Air Defense Forces meet for a "roundtable" in the editorial office:
Army General Ivan Moiseyevich Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister;
Colonel General Vladimir Vasilyevich Litvinov, first deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces;
Aviation Lieutenant General Oleg Vladimirovich Anisimov, deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces for aviation and chief of air defense aviation;
Colonel General Rasim Suleymanovich Akchurin, chief of air defense surface-to-air missile forces;
Major General Anatoliy Nikolayevich Dubrov, chief of the Air Defense Forces Main Staff Directorate;
Lieutenant Colonel Gennadiy Viktorovich Kozhin, chief of a military mission of the USSR Ministry of Defense;
Major Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich Kashin, commander of an antiaircraft missile battalion;
Captain Oleg Vladimirovich Startsev, chief of staff of a radiotechnical battalion.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] One of the chief tasks of the military reform is to equip the Armed Forces with modern hardware with high quality specifications. Is it possible to hope that over the next few years our country will not lose its position in military science and in the introduction of the latest technologies, and will fully supply the Air Defense Forces with highly efficient weapons, taking into account the reduction in defense spending?

[Tretyak] I will not be revealing a secret if I say that in recent years our country has managed to maintain defense at the necessary level and to ensure parity in the main types of arms, including modern air defense assets, at the cost of tremendous exertion of effort. In order to understand this, it is sufficient to compare the military budgets of the United States and the USSR and the proportion of the countries' GNP they represent. And, of course, the length of our borders has to be taken into account. While having less means and potential, we have, nonetheless, ensured equal security....

However, as historical experience shows, military parity is not something frozen and achieved once and for all. The forces of air and space attack, which are countered by our air defense, are developing dynamically and are being improved continuously. In recent years alone, the U.S. and NATO air forces have acquired fundamentally new strike means, many of which were demonstrated and tested in a combat situation in the Persian Gulf zone.

It is possible to include among these the so-called "invisible aircraft" developed using Stealth technology, like the F-117, and the cruise missiles with various launch modes (HARM, Tomahawk), which are capable of operating at extremely low altitudes and with a range of over 2,600 km. As well as powerful jamming resources (special electronic warfare aircraft), modern reconnaissance and control assets, including air-based (AWACS) and space-based ones, over-the-horizon radars, new types of highly accurate weapons, and much besides. What does all this indicate? That, even given a brief delay in the development of air defense assets, there is a real danger of falling hopelessly behind and losing the parity achieved with such difficulty. Roughly the same situation developed in Iraq, where by the late seventies a modern—for those times—air defense system had been created. Then its development was halted. And you know the results.

Of course, we cannot fail to take into account the fact that the situation in the world today has changed. There is no direct military confrontation. The talks process is playing an ever-greater role in ensuring parity. But I believe that our people must also know something else. The reduction in defense appropriations has presented us with the need to curtail work on certain scientific and technical problems, to abandon a number of programs for the development of promising types of air defense armament, and to reduce purchases of new combat hardware. It has to be admitted that in this respect we,

like the entire country, are going through difficult times. An agonizing reappraisal is being made of what has been achieved, and new views and concepts are being elaborated (particularly after the war in the Persian Gulf zone) with regard to building air defense.

I will emphasize: Industry can and must say a great deal here. Without modern arms and hardware it is pointless to speak of advanced tactics and strategy. Unfortunately, more and more problems are arising because of the collapse of the former economic ties. What is more, they are having a very direct influence on the troops' vital activity and combat readiness.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] If I understand correctly, military sectors, unlike civilian ones, are simply not allowed, figuratively speaking, to lag behind the technological supertrain, many seats in which have, alas, already been taken by the West. Is the conversion of defense enterprises, which is aimed precisely at reducing the share of military output, not making its "contribution" here?

[Kozhin] Allow me to explain something. This is an extremely complex question for our country, which is embarking upon market relations. Of course, the amount of military hardware and arms being produced must be reduced to sensible limits. But this must not affect their quality and their combat perfection. Because the United States, as far as I know, is not only not halting the development of modern military hardware but, on the contrary, is actually increasing it. Judge by the number of new models of arms and hardware used in the war against Iraq. However, we get the impression that by no means everyone wants to see this. Yes, cost is the most important regulator in the production of armament and military hardware. But, unfortunately, it is precisely in the formation of prices for military products that a departure from the means and methods developed over the years is now to be observed. Chaos and confusion in prices prevent efficient planning of financial activity and volumes of deliveries. As a result, over the past two years losses in the best-trained, skilled cadres in a number of enterprises have amounted to almost 25 percent. One wonders whether there is any justification for the hopes pinned to market relations which are to take shape in arms production. I think not.

It is surprising, but the whole civilized world is now introducing elements of production planning into its economy. But we, who accumulated this experience with such difficulty, are recklessly rushing into free market relations, which have not existed for a long time in a pure form in the most important sectors of industry in developed capitalist states.

[Akchurin] Now about another problem. Our newspapers, if you remember, wrote with passion about the Americans' most modern arms and their combat potential. And no one attempted to investigate what kind of potential we had or what our Army lacked. It was being said: If you lose some time rearming, you might lag behind forever. And yet the pace of troop rearmament here lags behind the growth in the combat potential of the leading NATO countries' offensive air weapons. Why? Because of the increase in the prices of arms and military hardware, the reduction in the funds allocated for their purchase, and the violation of economic ties and contract discipline. (Although our scientific and design organizations have developed a number of highly efficient models of air defense arms). Therefore we have been forced to maintain obsolete models of arms at the appropriate level by means of modifications, to improve the methods of their combat application....

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] There is no denying that our country's economy has long been sick. And this could not fail to hit at the Army. I believe that concern about this can largely account for the fact that our discussion has taken an economic turn. There is undoubtedly something for our legislators and the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Defense to ponder here. But this is not a task of just one day. What can be done and is already being done, proceeding from the present situation, in the interests of enhancing combat readiness? Have we exhausted everything, let us say, in enhancing the efficiency of military labor and intensifying the training process?

[Anisimov] Our academies and military schools are going over to new training plans and programs already this year. New combat training courses and new statutes on planning and holding tactical and operational-tactical exercises are being introduced in units and subunits of the categories of troops. In air defense aviation, for example, we are endeavoring to enhance the efficiency of literally every flight hour by packing it with training elements. On the ground, in turn, computers and video equipment are taking on an ever-greater load. With the help of computers it has been possible to optimize the use by flight crews of air weapons and target drones in combat shooting. The task now is to raise the standard of training of leadership personnel at the regiment-combined unit level by means of targeted retraining. Micro- and mini-electronics are held in esteem in the surface-to-air missile forces. Particularly in the specialized training centers, which make it possible within a short time not only to study several models of arms at once but also to train crews to operate them....

[Kashin] As one of the troops, I am prepared to confirm this from my own battalion's example. There is a shortage of people in connection with the boycott of the Army draft in certain republics. Therefore it is only possible to resolve the former tasks with fewer forces by intensifying military labor and the training process. Including the help of the training centers through which all of my subordinates have passed. It would be good if officers, ensigns, sergeants, and soldiers actually engaged in combat training, rather than administrative work [khozraboty]. Unfortunately, there is a lot of talk about this, but little progress. We officers of the troops are

concerned that the implementation of the military reform is unjustifiably protracted. There are virtually no changes "down below."

I would not like to guess at why the law on defense is taking so long to appear. And yet such negative processes as draft boycotts, evasion of service, and others are largely due to the lack of a clear-cut legislative base.

[Dubrov] This is evidently what must be borne in mind here. Of course, we would all like the transformations to proceed more quickly. But such cardinal changes in the troops' life and service are not accomplished overnight, however much we all wish for this.... As regards changes in the structure and formation of air defense, they have already become a reality. Take such an important element as control organs. Here the reform is proceeding in two directions. The first is the reduction in the number of control organs by means of reorganizing and improving their structures. The second is the reduction in the number of air defense large strategic formations and combined units, as dictated by the future reduction of Air Defense Forces as a whole by 18-19 percent.

But this is what must definitely be remembered. The experience of the war in the Persian Gulf zone showed that success can only be achieved with the strict vertical subordination of all troop control organs in fulfilling the command's decisions. I am in favor of reducing control organs. But, if their reduction takes place without a simultaneous increase in the pool of automated control systems and their modernization and introduction into the troops, this will have a negative effect on combat readiness. This is why it is quite impossible to agree with the opinion of the authors of certain articles in the mass media, who try to adapt the control structures developed for the national economy to military conditions.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Alas, another problem has appeared recently, which has not yet been mentioned here but which must be reckoned with. The point is that certain republics, in violation of the USSR Constitution, are creating their own national armies and customs services on borders and declaring a monopoly on the ownership of airspace. And yet extraterritoriality is of exceptional importance to the Air Defense Forces. How is this fundamental principle of military building seen under the new conditions?

[Litvinov] An age-old folk proverb was proved by the results of the referendum, when 76.4 percent of participants voted for the preservation of the USSR as a unified state with a unified Army: It is easier to resolve difficult tasks as a united family, all together, as the saying goes. It was precisely this that helped our state to survive and hold out during the bad years.

It is noteworthy that even those countries whose example is particularly valued by our opponents are also creating collective security systems, including unified air defenses. There is the combined NATO air defense system in Europe and the air defense of the North American continent.

I personally have seen how this is done. Last October, as a member of a military delegation, I visited a command post of NORAD [North American Air Defense Command], from where joint control of the U.S. and Canadian air defense forces and assets is effected.

At the same time the well-known events in East Europe have resulted in the elimination of the Warsaw Pact states' unified air defense system. But some of our former allies are already expressing a wish to conclude bilateral treaties with the USSR and with each other. Measures for mutual security are also being taken in the Far East for flights of aircraft close to the state borders of the USSR and the United States.

In our country the Air Defense Forces were created and have been improved as a unified comprehensive system to defend the country and the Armed Forces against strikes from the air and from space. This system starts at the forward positions of the USSR, is echeloned in depth, and has a ramified control system. A compulsory condition is the ability to concentrate efforts in various areas. Here defense has to be provided for all the republics, their administrative-political centers, industrial regions, power generation facilities, communications centers.... These tasks can only be resolved with unified, centralized military control. Splitting up air defense among republics and regions would sharply reduce the efficiency of the combat use of its forces, deprive it of maneuverability, and in individual cases reduce its potential practically to zero.

Abandonment of the principle of extraterritoriality would also result in the elimination of the most important defensive systems to warn of a missile attack, elements of which are deployed around the perimeter of the USSR's territory in various republics, and function as a unified complex.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] It turns out that, of all the branches of the Armed Forces, the Air Defense Forces have ended up, as it were, in the most difficult position. On the one hand, there is uncertainty as to science and appropriations, and there are proposals to eliminate them altogether as an independent branch of the Armed Forces. On the other hand, there are attacks in the radical press, accusing them, in one case, of not downing Rust and, in another, of... downing the Boeing. On yet another hand, there are problems of manpower acquisition, rearmament, and cooperation with the local population in areas of interethnic conflicts. And yet no one makes any allowances for this in resolving alert duty tasks....

[Tretyak] True: A tight knot has been tied. And yet I would not overdramatize the situation. The Air Defense Forces have been and, I will emphasize, will remain permanently ready troops. This is the chief point. Hence the corresponding demands on them and their being equipped with all they need. Whether we want this or not, we must keep up with the "age." How? It is true that we do all we can to preserve aging hardware and arms

and to maintain them at the appropriate level. But this will not get you far, as the saying goes. Of course, we also have the most modern hardware which, as you yourselves understand, has no need of any special publicity. For example, the highly maneuverable Su-27 and MIG-31 fighters, the long-range and intermediate-range multichannel surface-to-air missile systems, and the three-dimensional jamproof radars. It is important that the proportion of these should increase among the troops.

However hard this may be, we do not intend to cease research work on the creation of promising defensive means. For example, radars for early warning of an air attack, long-range interceptors, and highly mobile surface-to-air missile complexes. We also hope that the measures being taken in the country to stabilize and develop the economy will prevent us from losing the level we have attained in military science and in the introduction of the latest technologies.

[Akchurin] We military people, above all, should always remember the lessons of 1941. These are different times. However, the foreign policy situation still does not give any grounds for a placid mood. Take any question—political, economic.... Everywhere, before helping us, they demand, as a rule, some concessions from us and lay down conditions advantageous to themselves above all. And yet it is not far from there to diktat.

I will emphasize: Like any Soviet person, I am resolutely opposed to military confrontation, and I advocate mutual concessions and broad accords. But on conditions equal for both sides. What do we see in practice? The NATO bloc has not broken up following the Warsaw Pact's self-disbandment. What is more, some of our former allies have gotten the idea of joining it. And what is happening on our borders? The number of flights by reconnaissance aircraft has fallen somewhat. But there are still very many of them. Here are the figures. During just one week in March, 194 antiaircraft missile battalions were placed on alert condition 1 to stop possible airspace violations. These too, unfortunately, are the realities nowadays.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] There must be no haste in such an important matter as formulating the concept of building air defenses in keeping with the demands of the new defensive doctrine. An objective, comprehensive assessment of the foreign policy situation is needed. But changes—considerable ones—are in evidence in the world. So, taking this into account, would it not be better to channel some appropriations not into the production of hardware and arms but into improving the social and domestic conditions of officers and ensigns and into building accommodation?

[Startsev] Clearly, there is a need for this. There are decrepit barracks in many units, and officers live in condemned houses. Sometimes there are insufficient funds even for cosmetic repairs to them. Although there is now a possibility of equipping some radiotechnical subunits in the Kuriles. But the same thing is awaited in Vladivostok, Komsomolsk-na-Amure, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy....

As regards saving funds, sometimes we ourselves are manifestly improvident. We have an extensive pool of old radars. Why is it that only subunit commanders tackle the question of extending their service life? Industry forgot about them long ago and does not produce spare parts, tools, and accessories kits, and hardware that is still perfectly maintainable stands idle. But new hardware is expensive, and industry's potential is finite.

Or take this example of "savings." There was a helicopter transport detachment in our combined unit which was successfully resolving many questions of combat readiness and of ensuring vital activity. It has now been disbanded. But there will be no saving. Questions connected with transport will have to be resolved just the same, and they will be. However, what price will the company and battalion commanders and, in the final analysis, the state pay for this?

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] I would like to end our discussion with a question which, as the mail attests, is of interest to many KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers. In what way will air defense develop in our country and in other countries over the next few years?

[Dubrov] Many debates are now centered on the question of how many branches of the Armed Forces we should have and whether the Air Defense Forces are needed as an independent branch. And here, as a rule, there follow references to foreign experience. But let us investigate why the United States, for example, does not have air defense as a separate branch of the armed forces. It does not because there are no bases on its borders from which a raid or an air attack can be expected. That is, the United States simply does not need air defense as a system. It manages with fighter aircraft and early-warning radar posts.

The situation in our country is totally different, since a large number of offensive air weapons is located in the immediate vicinity of the USSR's borders. The U.S. Air Force elements at forward airbases alone includes more than 1,700 combat aircraft (over 1,000 in the European zone, 100 in the Near and Middle East, and more than 600 in the Pacific zone), and it could be significantly reinforced at any moment. In addition, the U.S. Navy has 15 aircraft carriers and 99 surface ships and submarines—which carry "ship-to-shore" cruise missiles—capable of operating in maritime regions off the USSR's borders.

Nevertheless, the United States is reconsidering its attitude to air defense and has set up a strategic air command which, while not being an independent branch of the armed forces, practically fulfills the task of one and has a system of NORAD command posts and space- and ground-based reconnaissance assets. Work has been going on since 1986 on the "Air Defense Initiative"

program (in the United States it is called "ADI"), which provides for a multiechelon air defense system for the North American continent....

[Tretyak] What conclusion can be drawn from all that has been said? First of all, I wish to thank the participants in the debate for their interesting suggestions and sensible advice. They will be taken into account. The concern with which they have been advanced attests that we are all equally concerned about the aforementioned problems of strengthening the country's defense capability—problems which undoubtedly must be resolved.

And the second point. Like the whole world, we saw how, during the war in the Persian Gulf zone, the aircraft of the multinational force struck a massive blow primarily against Iraq's centralized air defense control system. The desire of the opposing side to destroy the air defenses above all clearly shows the increasing role of this branch of troops not only in wartime but also in peacetime. It is inadmissible not to take all this into account in military building.

Cabinet Allocates Food for Officers, Families

PM2806103891 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "At the USSR Cabinet of Ministers"]

[Text] With a view to improving food supplies for officer personnel of the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the USSR KGB, and the railroad troops who are not entitled to receive food at the state's expense, and also for the families of servicemen living in the Baltic and Transcaucasian republics, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has allocated to the USSR Defense Ministry the following additional amounts for the second half of 1991:

9,700 tonnes of meat and meat products (in meat equivalent), 49,500 tonnes of milk and dairy products (in milk equivalent), 2,900 tonnes of vegetable oil, and 4,300 tonnes of sugar, out of the USSR Government reserve;

13,900 tonnes of edible fish products, including canned fish, by means of reducing the market allocation to specific consumers.

The USSR State Committee for Purchases of Food Resources, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Trade are instructed to ensure the delivery to the USSR Defense Ministry of the said volumes of food products in an appropriate product mix.

The USSR Defense Ministry, in conjunction with the USSR MVD, the USSR KGB, and the Main Administration of Railroad Troops, are to determine the procedure for issuing for payment, per person per month, these and other products on the basis of the resources available to the said ministries and departments.

Agricultural

Tomsk Bans Reservists From Harvest Battalions

PM2806135991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksandr Solovyev under "Direct Line" rubric]

[Text] Tomsk—A session of the oblast soviet has banned enterprises, organizations, and the oblast military commissariat from sending reserve servicemen to the harvest battalions.

The Tomsk grain growers working in the risky arable farming zone themselves sometimes need assistance from the city machine operators and repair workers. Therefore the oblast soviet deputies rejected the orders repeated every year by the Siberian Military District for the formation of harvest battalions using reserve servicemen.

The session's decision has been sent to the USSR defense minister and the Siberian Military District command.

Chernoivanov Interviewed on 1991 Prospects

914B0193A Moscow ZEMLYA I LYUDI in Russian No 23-24, 14 Jun 91 pp 1-2

[Interview with V.I. Chernoivanov, USSR minister of agriculture and food, by unidentified ZEMLYA I LYUDI correspondent; place and date not given: "Finding a Solution to the Crisis Is the Most Important Task"]

[Text] [ZEMLYA I LYUDI] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, a new Union organ has been set up to manage agro-industrial production—the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food. What are its functions and tasks?

[Chernoivanov] Our ministry is new not only in name but also in terms of the functions that it exercises. At present, questions relating to direct management of the agro-industrial complex are handled by the republic Councils of Ministers and the executive committees of the soviets of people's deputies in the krays and oblasts. It is they that are mainly responsible for supplies of food for the population on their own territories, and they independently draw up and implement programs to increase production and market food, and for the social development of the countryside.

At the Union level, coordination of the activity of the agro-industrial complex is done for the country as a whole. Together with the republics the center shapes and pursues a unified agrarian, economic, and scientific and technical policy. In other words, the republics, krays, and oblasts fulfill economic functions and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food exercises national functions, and also functions that are delegated to the center by the republics.

Let me name the chief of those functions. They are to represent the interests of the peasants and of the agrarian sector as a whole in the government, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the ministries and departments, and to ensure the balanced development of the agro-industrial complex within the framework of the country's national economy.

Our ministry has also been entrusted with the task of implementing a unified state policy in the field of scientific and technical progress, land use and land management, melioration, seed growing, strain testing, pedigree breeding, veterinary science, and quarantine matters. The functions of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food include coordination of a whole range of questions connected with material-technical supply for agriculture and the processing sectors, and developing an effective economic mechanism for the economy in the countryside. Other tasks handled by the ministry include work to improve pricing, observing price parity, and ensuring equivalent exchange between agriculture and industry and other sectors. One other important function is participation in carrying out the land reform.

[ZEMLYA I LYUDI] Almost a year has passed since completion of the first stage of the Constituent Congress of the USSR Peasants Union. Its second stage took place recently. What has been done by the Union organs to implement the decisions of the first stage of that congress?

[Chernoivanov] First of all, during this time 75 billion rubles of state debt from bank loans has been written off for kolkhozes and sovkhozes and other agricultural enterprises. The so-called cartage additions to goods sold in the countryside have been eliminated. The tax on equipment operated above normatives has been abolished. The procedure for marketing grain and the seeds of oleaginous crops has been expanded. Unified countrywide privileges have been established for mothers with many children, including those living in the countryside. Questions relating to the creation, reorganization, and liquidation of agricultural enterprises, and to funding for improvements made to irrigated and drained land are now being resolved at the local level. Finally, it was precisely at the insistence of the USSR Peasants Union that the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food has been set up.

As is known, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers recently adopted the resolution "On Compensation in 1991 for Additional Costs Borne by Enterprises and Organizations in the Agro-Industrial Complex Connected With the Price Reform." This is only the start of work to ensure equivalency between the agro-industrial complex and other sectors of the national economy, and it will be continued.

Firm business ties have established between the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food and the USSR Peasants Union. We have jointly undertaken and are undertaking a number of measures to deal with the decline in production and to increase stability in the work of the enterprises.

[ZEMLYA I LYUDI] What measures?

[Chernoivanov] Let me name the main directions in the work to find a solution to the food crisis. The first is to carry out land reform. The second is to resolve social questions in the countryside. The third is to strengthen the material-technical base for agriculture and the processing sectors. Taken all together in combination with the switch to a market economy, they represent the strategic path to stabilization of food production and its further buildup.

[ZEMLYA I LYUDI] How is the land reform going?

[Chernoivanov] Its main task is to eliminate monopolism in land use and make it available to all who want it and—the main thing—can work it. It also includes the creation of a multifaceted agrarian economy, the existence of various types of farms in the countryside, ensuring equal economic, legal, and material-technical conditions for their functioning, and state support for new forms of farming, including peasant farms, leased farms, and others.

Land reform is just taking its first steps. It is not being done everywhere in the way it was envisaged or as might be desired. But in general the process is moving along actively. At the Union level a whole series of decisions has been adopted connected with work on new legal enactments, provisions, and recommendations and making improvements to those passed earlier. The USSR government and ministries have abolished or replaced within the set time periods more than 70 departmental and other normative documents.
nd Management in the USSR" and the "Recommendations on Finding Unused Land and Land Being Used Irrationally" have been approved and passed on to the republics. The USSR State Committee for Statistics has approved the form for the quarterly state statistical accountability report "On Land In Ownership and Use," which will make it possible to have reliable information on the formation of the special land fund.

In addition, drafts have been prepared for a whole series of resolutions. They include a program to support peasant farms, "On Procedure for Introducing a Land Register, Land Monitoring, and Principles for Payments for Land," and others.

At the republic level the land reform is being implemented in a practical way. At the local level much work is being done to make an inventory of the land and establish a special land fund for the local soviets of people's deputies. More than 7 million hectares have already been found to include in it. More than 60,000 peasant farms have been set up, using almost 1.5 million

hectares of land. It is expected that before the end of the year at least another 20,000 tenant farms will be formed. This process is proceeding most actively in the RSFSR and the Baltic republics. Since the beginning of the year alone, more than 20,000 peasant (tenant) farms have set up in the Russian Federation.

The tasks in complying with the Fundamentals of Legislation in the USSR and the Union republics on land and the course of land reform were recently comprehensively reviewed at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. An appropriate resolution was passed. It has been published in the press and so I will not dwell on it. But let me name some of its most important provisions. The USSR Supreme Soviet resolved as follows:

—to work on and approve principles for establishing payments for land and procedure for maintaining the state land register and for land monitoring;

—to complete work this year and put into effect in 1992 a program of state support for peasant and private subsidiary farming and rural cooperatives;

—to review the question of forming at the Union level an organ to coordinate work on an interdepartmental basis on land reform and land management;

—to prepare draft legislation on the main directions of the agrarian reform in the country and submit it for review by the next, sixth, session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

This is the main program for further implementation of the land reform.

[ZEMLYA I LYUDI] What is being done to resolve social questions in the countryside?

[Chernoivanov] With the participation of the Union republics the USSR government has drawn up and approved a program for social development in the countryside, which sets forth the main directions of social restructuring during the period 1991-1995 and tasks through the year 2000. The total cost of the work envisaged by the program will be about 200 billion rubles in new prices, 1.5 times more than the preceding five-year period. It has been determined that during the current five-year period the commissioning of housing and preschools should grow by a factor of 1.4, schools by a factor of 1.8, gas networks by a factor of two, and hard-surfaced roads by a factor of 1.6.

The following work has been done in the matter of practical implementation of this program at the Union level:

—a program for gasification and electrification of the countryside and providing rural homes with independent sewage systems and equipment has been submitted to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers for approval. The program provides for per capita provision of network gas to be increased by a factor of 2.5, and electricity consumption in the countryside to be increased by a factor of 1.4 during the period 1991-1995;

—a draft has been prepared for a resolution "On Organizational- Economic Methods To Attract Manpower to Rural Areas by Using People Who Resettle From Regions, Cities, and Industrial Centers, and Also Servicemen Retired to the Reserves";

—jointly with the USSR Academy of Sciences and the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, a program has been approved for scientific research work on problems of social-demographic development in the countryside during the period 1991-1995;

—jointly with the USSR State Committee for Construction, normative documents and plans have been prepared for peasant farms and farms, and normatives for construction in the countryside have been clarified. Here, the main emphasis has been laid on the revival of small villages and hamlets and providing them with roads, heat-and-power networks, and services facilities.

I have named only the main directions in work to improve social life in the countryside. A great deal else needs to be done. It must be candidly stated that without the resolution of social issues and without the creation of proper working and living conditions in the countryside we will not revive the villages nor deal with the food crisis.

[ZEMLYA I LYUDI] How do things stand with respect to strengthening and modernizing the material-technical base of the agro-industrial complex?

[Chernoivanov] This is a question of the extreme importance. Agricultural machine building is experiencing a serious crisis. Let me cite some figures.

In 1986 the country's agriculture received 384,000 tractors, while last year the figure was 299,000. The corresponding figures for trucks are 317,000 and 302,000; for plows 218,000 and 181,000; for sowing machines 242,000 and 124,000; for the use of organic fertilizers 48,000 and 34,000; for forage harvesters and ensilage harvesters 44,000 and 35,600; for grain combines 111,000 and 67,000.

As a result the total number of grain combines available for the country's agricultural enterprises has fallen by 139,000 compared to 1985. The average load on machines countrywide has risen from 134 to 170 hectares; in the RSFSR the load has risen from 129 to 174 hectares, in Kazakhstan from 199 to 257 hectares. For this reason alone harvesting of grain crops is taking a week or more. Hence the losses and the deteriorating quality of the grain.

Deliveries of material-technical equipment to agriculture declined during the first four months of the year. The agro-industrial complex failed to receive about 6,000 trucks, 21,000 tractors, almost 3,500 tractor mower attachments, 600 pickup bailers, about 250,000 batteries, 286,000 tons of diesel fuel, and more than 80,000 tons of gasoline. The agrarian sector also failed to receive large quantities of spare parts.

As is known, the USSR presidential ukase "On Urgent Measures in Agriculture" introduced a special regime to provide agriculture with material-technical resources. Personal responsibility is being increased and sanctions are becoming more stringent against leaders and collectives at enterprises that fail to meet targets for deliveries of machines, equipment, and spare parts and fuel and lubricating materials for rural people.

Our position of principle is that material-technical supply for the agro-industrial complex be carried out at the level of state orders that are mandatory. Demand in the agrarian sector for production and technical equipment should be given priority. A similar procedure must be established for supplies of raw materials and materials for enterprises that manufacture equipment and spare parts for the agro-industrial complex. Only this kind of approach to material-technical supply for agriculture and the processing sectors will enable us to correct the situation with respect to deliveries of machines, equipment, mineral fertilizers, and plant protection agents to the countryside.

[ZEMLYA I LYUDI] A final question. How has the sowing gone and what are its results?

[Chernoivanov] The rates for spring sowing work were at the same level as last year in many regions. And this despite the difficulties with material-technical supply, despite the large volume of repair and field work caused by the prolonged rain last autumn, and despite the present late spring. The sowing has been completed within the usual timeframe—the first 10 days of June.

Grain (including winter grains) has been sown to virtually the same area as last year, namely 111 million hectares. Spring crops have been sown to 144 million hectares. Grain procurement is already under way at farms in Central Asia, the Transcaucasus, the south of Kazakhstan, and the Ukraine.

The main thing now is timely and good-quality preparations for the harvesting. This means that harvesting equipment and transport must be repaired in good time, and last year's mistakes must not be repeated, and therefore the necessary reserves of fuel and lubricant materials must be not only decided but also created. Another important task is to set the grain conveyer apparatus and the potato and fruit and vegetable storage facilities in good order.

I would particularly like to talk about help for the countryside from the city. We still cannot get by without it. Not because recruiting the urban population and transport from industrial and other enterprises and the organization of the harvesting constitute some mandatory attribute of mass agricultural work in the autumn. No, help from the city for the countryside is needed because the agro-industrial complex still does not have the necessary material-technical base to harvest, transport, store, and process agricultural output.

Accordingly, the state and society and each enterprise face the choice: Help the countryside and be assured of foodstuffs or stand on the sidelines of the harvesting work and then experience food shortages. Practical need and common sense confirm that only extensive help from the collectives at industrial enterprises and in transport, and stepped-up work in the fields and on the farms by the workers themselves, and honest and interested labor on all sectors of agricultural production will ensure the timely and good-quality harvesting and stabilization of the situation with respect to supplies for the population, first and foremost the urban population, and subsequent extrication of the country from the food crisis.

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts Carry Out Second Space Walk

LD2806220791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1935 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun (TASS)—Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarksiy and Sergey Krikalev completed one space walk. They have been aboard the Mir Soviet orbital complex since 20 May. This is their second space walk. They first worked outside the station on 25 June.

The main task facing the cosmonauts this time is to install "Trek" Soviet-American scientific equipment for registering the nuclei of heavy elements in cosmic rays. It is also planned to install a television camera and to set up a cargo boom.

Space Walk Details Reported

LD2906094591 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—Anatoliy Artsebarkiy and Sergey Krikalev have completed their second round of work in outer space on the Mir space station's surface.

They opened the Kvant-2 module's outer hatch at 22:02 Moscow time on Friday.

On the surface, the cosmonauts mounted two panels of the Trek scientific equipment for studying the processes of generation and distribution of space beams' superheavy nuclei in the galaxy. The experiment was devised by Soviet and U.S. scientists.

The crew installed a set of detectors to measure streams and spectra of charged particles of space origin.

Later, the cosmonauts mounted an additional television camera on a solar battery and tested it.

Artsebarkiy and Krikalev used a telescopic arm installed on the station's surface by the previous crew, to get to the lock compartment of the Kvant-2 module.

The cosmonauts have taken an experimental thermomechanical joint back to the station. The sample was on the station's surface for four days.

Artsebarkiy and Krikalev, who worked in outer space for three hours and 24 minutes, are feeling well.

Italian Astronaut Invited to Mir Complex

LD2806065691 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By correspondent Aleksey Golyayev]

[Text] Rome June 27 TASS—The Soviet Union is inviting an Italian cosmonaut to work on board the Mir orbital complex, said General Vladimir Shatalov, head of the cosmonauts training centre in Zvezdniy, now on a visit here.

Speaking at a seminar devoted to Soviet-Italian cooperation in space exploration, he said that an extensive international programme of work in various fields had been drawn up for the Mir station. Italy is taking part in the work together with other countries. Italian specialists are developing a space platform where a telescope will be installed. An Italian cosmonaut could work with this instrument during the space mission, Shatalov said.

The head of the Soviet cosmonauts training centre held a number of meetings with scientists and businessmen in Italy. They discussed prospects of the expansion of Soviet-Italian cooperation in space exploration.

Interrepublic Nuclear Safety Council Set Up

PM2806094391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[From IZVESTIYA, TASS, IAN, RIA, and REUTER roundup: "Interrepublic Council Set Up"]

[Text] All 15 republics have acknowledged the advisability of setting up an Interrepublic Council on Safety in Industry and Atomic Power Engineering.

This decision was adopted recently at the USSR State Committee for Safety in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry by a representative meeting of republic bodies overseeing safety in industry and the atomic power industry. The council that has been set up is a consultative body, Yu. Rogozhin, chief of the USSR State Committee for Safety in Industry and Atomic Power Industry Press Center, said.

Germans Help Monitor Chernobyl Contamination

PM2806081791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent N. Kireyev report: "In the Chernobyl 'Ring'"]

[Text] Kaluga Oblast—Independent experts from the FRG have been working for a long time in a number of the rayons of Kaluga Oblast which were most severely affected by the Chernobyl disaster. The German specialists have surveyed 40 population centers and checked radiation levels in the environment and in food products from fields and livestock units. The level of radionuclide pollution in a number of places was below permissible norms.

Admittedly, there were also some disappointing surprises. For instance, checks on a consignment of meat destined for hospitals and kindergartens from a local meat combine revealed radionuclides three and one-half times above permissible levels. Large doses of undesirable substances were discovered in dried mushrooms, medicinal herbs, and other fruits of the forest.

Economic

Yazov Notes 'Enormous Strain' Placed on Army

LD2806121091 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1112 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun—USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov pointed to the complex conditions in which the Army has to ensure the country's security. Speaking in Moscow at the all-Army Komsomol conference today, he noted that the half-million [troop] reduction of the Army and Navy, the implementation of the treaty of medium- and short-range missiles, the continuing withdrawal of troops from abroad, and the creation of a defense grouping of armed forces within the USSR borders "has brought enormous strain."

"The USSR armed forces are carrying out their main task—reliably ensuring the country's defense and security—while the military budget is steadily dwindling, and social and everyday problems are accumulating," Dmitriy Yazov said. He noted also the adoption of anti-constitutional acts on the issue of defense in a number of republics, and the fact that discrimination against servicemen and their families and a coordinated anti-Army campaign in the media have a negative effect on the life and actvity of the Army.

The USSR minister of defense said that the Army is suffering "tangible losses" in the ideological struggle for young people. He said that over the last two years, the number of Komsomol members among young soldiers has dropped by almost a half. Dmitriy Yazov put the blame for that on "destructive and nationalist-separatist forces" which, by lie and slander, discredit the Komsomol in order to deprive today's young people of leaders who can lead them. Having pointed to the need of "immediate and, to the highest degree, vigorous work," Dmitriy Yazov stressed that "one of the main sources of our fatherland's military glory, might, and the

invincibility of our Army" consists in "initiating young soldiers to the traditions of soldiers' friendship and military comradeship".

Addresses Young Communists

LD2806181291 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov pointed to the complicated present conditions under which the Army is called upon to ensure the country's security.

He was speaking at a conference of young communists serving in Soviet Armed Forces. Yazov told the conference that great efforts were demanded by the recent moves, including the reduction of Soviet Armed Forces by half-a-million, the fulfilment of the INF treaty, the continuing withdrawal of Soviet troops from other countries and the establishment of a defence armed force within the Soviet state borders.

"The Soviet Armed Forces have to accomplish their main task of ensuring the country's defence and security despite continuous cuts in the military budget and snowballing social and everyday problems," Yazov said.

He noted that the Soviet Armed Forces have had to withstand the negative impact of unconstitutional laws on defence promulgated in some republics, cases of discriminations against servicemen and their dependents and a coordinated anti-Army campaign launched by mass media.

The Soviet defence minister said the army has sustained considerable losses in the ideological struggle for the minds and hearts of the younger generation.

He said the number of young communists among conscripts has reduced nearly twice over the past two years. Yazov charged "destructive nationalist and separatist forces" with stepping up a campaign of lies and slander aimed at discrediting the Young Communist League and depriving the younger generation of its own leaders.

Yazov pointed to the need to make crucial vigorous efforts to ensure that young servicemen imbibe traditions of military friendship and army camaraderie, which have always served as one of the main sources of the country's military glory and the Army's might and invincibility.

Army Komsomol Rally Ends; Officials Elected

PM2806175591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Kovalev and Captain V. Popov report: "At First All-Army Komsomol Conference. Choice Made, Aims Determined"]

[Text] USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov addressed delegates at the morning sitting of the second day of the [First All-Army Komsomol] conference's work.

Discussion of the Programmatic Aims of the Armed Forces' Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Organization and its Statutes continued. There was no trace of the regulated unanimity of bygone times at Army Komsomol forums.

Amid an uncompromising "clash" of highly varied opinions and judgments ideological-political, educative, moral, and social priorities were defined in the life and activity of the Komsomol in uniform.

Delegates made their choice. Ideological unity based on the creative development of Marxist theory, Lenin's teaching on the defense of the socialist Fatherland, and the achievements of contemporary socialist thought.

The Army Komsomol's main aim is to consistently implement a state youth policy, create conditions for the all-around development of the young person, reveal his creative potential in the interests of military service, and rear a citizen and a patriot.

After electing the Komsomol Organization's central organs the delegates completed their work.

In-depth, all-around analysis of the results of the conference lies ahead. Even now this can be said to be a key, landmark event in the career of the Armed Forces' Komsomol.

On the same day the All-Army Council of Komsomol Organizations held a plenum. It elected the Bureau members, chairman, and deputy chairmen of the All-Army Council of Komsomol Organizations. Lieutenant Colonel Aleksey Reshetnikov was elected chairman.

Defense Cuts Hampering Space Research, Design

LD2906102291 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 29 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—It is difficult to dispute the need for conversion processes in the defence industry. But any programme, particulary such as conversion, must be thoroughly weighed and substantiated, general Igor Kurinnoy, head of the Soviet Defence Ministry's Military and Political Department for Space Research, told TASS.

"My attitude to conversion problems is varied," the general said. "By way of a general evaluation of the conversion process, I can say that the defence industry has lost much more than the economy has acquired.

"A military person cannot stay indifferent to a decline in the general potential of the industry that operated on the strength of orders placed by the Defence Ministry.

"Cuts in appropriations for the defence sector led to the termination or considerable slowdown in the pace of the implementation of a number of research and design projects that were being translated into reality through orders placed by the Defence Ministry. This also led to a decrease in orders for quantity-produced equipment. The under-capacity operation of defence-sector plants gives rise to rather negative processes.

"One should not forget that as of today the defence sector represents the cutting edge of the Soviet industry which has available the most up-to-date equipment, has created unique instruments and the most advanced technology," Kurinnoy said.

Speaking about space research sector conversion, the general said that a number of space systems being used by the Defence Ministry can be applied for civilian purposes.

It is essential to develop such dual-purpose systems on a share basis with those organisations that are interested in creating them. This will thereby obviate the need for the development of special spacecraft to accomplish purely civilian tasks, Kurinnoy said.

Air Defense Forces Status, Future Discussed

PM2806120191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[Account of roundtable discussion by Colonel A. Yurkin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA permanent correspondent for the Air Defense Forces, and Lieutenant Colonel O. Falichev, deputy editor of the Missile and Air Defense Forces Combat Training Desk, under the "'Roundtable': Military Reform and the Air Defense Forces" rubric: "Dynamics of Parity"]

[Text] We have already familiarized readers with some problems and development prospects of the Strategic Rocket Forces and the Ground Forces (the issues for 19 March and 18 April 1991). Today representatives of the Air Defense Forces meet for a "roundtable" in the editorial office:
Army General Ivan Moiseyevich Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister;
Colonel General Vladimir Vasilyevich Litvinov, first deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces;
Aviation Lieutenant General Oleg Vladimirovich Anisimov, deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces for aviation and chief of air defense aviation;
Colonel General Rasim Suleymanovich Akchurin, chief of air defense surface-to-air missile forces;
Major General Anatoliy Nikolayevich Dubrov, chief of the Air Defense Forces Main Staff Directorate;
Lieutenant Colonel Gennadiy Viktorovich Kozhin, chief of a military mission of the USSR Ministry of Defense;
Major Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich Kashin, commander of an antiaircraft missile battalion;
Captain Oleg Vladimirovich Startsev, chief of staff of a radiotechnical battalion.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] One of the chief tasks of the military reform is to equip the Armed Forces with modern hardware with high quality specifications. Is it possible to hope that over the next few years our country will not lose its position in military science and in the introduction of the latest technologies, and will fully supply the Air Defense Forces with highly efficient weapons, taking into account the reduction in defense spending?

[Tretyak] I will not be revealing a secret if I say that in recent years our country has managed to maintain defense at the necessary level and to ensure parity in the main types of arms, including modern air defense assets, at the cost of tremendous exertion of effort. In order to understand this, it is sufficient to compare the military budgets of the United States and the USSR and the proportion of the countries' GNP they represent. And, of course, the length of our borders has to be taken into account. While having less means and potential, we have, nonetheless, ensured equal security....

However, as historical experience shows, military parity is not something frozen and achieved once and for all. The forces of air and space attack, which are countered by our air defense, are developing dynamically and are being improved continuously. In recent years alone, the U.S. and NATO air forces have acquired fundamentally new strike means, many of which were demonstrated and tested in a combat situation in the Persian Gulf zone.

It is possible to include among these the so-called "invisible aircraft" developed using Stealth technology, like the F-117, and the cruise missiles with various launch modes (HARM, Tomahawk), which are capable of operating at extremely low altitudes and with a range of over 2,600 km. As well as powerful jamming resources (special electronic warfare aircraft), modern reconnaissance and control assets, including air-based (AWACS) and space-based ones, over-the-horizon radars, new types of highly accurate weapons, and much besides. What does all this indicate? That, even given a brief delay in the development of air defense assets, there is a real danger of falling hopelessly behind and losing the parity achieved with such difficulty. Roughly the same situation developed in Iraq, where by the late seventies a modern—for those times—air defense system had been created. Then its development was halted. And you know the results.

Of course, we cannot fail to take into account the fact that the situation in the world today has changed. There is no direct military confrontation. The talks process is playing an ever-greater role in ensuring parity. But I believe that our people must also know something else. The reduction in defense appropriations has presented us with the need to curtail work on certain scientific and technical problems, to abandon a number of programs for the development of promising types of air defense armament, and to reduce purchases of new combat hardware. It has to be admitted that in this respect we,

like the entire country, are going through difficult times. An agonizing reappraisal is being made of what has been achieved, and new views and concepts are being elaborated (particularly after the war in the Persian Gulf zone) with regard to building air defense.

I will emphasize: Industry can and must say a great deal here. Without modern arms and hardware it is pointless to speak of advanced tactics and strategy. Unfortunately, more and more problems are arising because of the collapse of the former economic ties. What is more, they are having a very direct influence on the troops' vital activity and combat readiness.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] If I understand correctly, military sectors, unlike civilian ones, are simply not allowed, figuratively speaking, to lag behind the technological supertrain, many seats in which have, alas, already been taken by the West. Is the conversion of defense enterprises, which is aimed precisely at reducing the share of military output, not making its "contribution" here?

[Kozhin] Allow me to explain something. This is an extremely complex question for our country, which is embarking upon market relations. Of course, the amount of military hardware and arms being produced must be reduced to sensible limits. But this must not affect their quality and their combat perfection. Because the United States, as far as I know, is not only not halting the development of modern military hardware but, on the contrary, is actually increasing it. Judge by the number of new models of arms and hardware used in the war against Iraq. However, we get the impression that by no means everyone wants to see this. Yes, cost is the most important regulator in the production of armament and military hardware. But, unfortunately, it is precisely in the formation of prices for military products that a departure from the means and methods developed over the years is now to be observed. Chaos and confusion in prices prevent efficient planning of financial activity and volumes of deliveries. As a result, over the past two years losses in the best-trained, skilled cadres in a number of enterprises have amounted to almost 25 percent. One wonders whether there is any justification for the hopes pinned to market relations which are to take shape in arms production. I think not.

It is surprising, but the whole civilized world is now introducing elements of production planning into its economy. But we, who accumulated this experience with such difficulty, are recklessly rushing into free market relations, which have not existed for a long time in a pure form in the most important sectors of industry in developed capitalist states.

[Akchurin] Now about another problem. Our newspapers, if you remember, wrote with passion about the Americans' most modern arms and their combat potential. And no one attempted to investigate what kind of potential we had or what our Army lacked. It was being said: If you lose some time rearming, you might lag behind forever. And yet the pace of troop rearmament here lags behind the growth in the combat potential of the leading NATO countries' offensive air weapons. Why? Because of the increase in the prices of arms and military hardware, the reduction in the funds allocated for their purchase, and the violation of economic ties and contract discipline. (Although our scientific and design organizations have developed a number of highly efficient models of air defense arms). Therefore we have been forced to maintain obsolete models of arms at the appropriate level by means of modifications, to improve the methods of their combat application....

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] There is no denying that our country's economy has long been sick. And this could not fail to hit at the Army. I believe that concern about this can largely account for the fact that our discussion has taken an economic turn. There is undoubtedly something for our legislators and the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Defense to ponder here. But this is not a task of just one day. What can be done and is already being done, proceeding from the present situation, in the interests of enhancing combat readiness? Have we exhausted everything, let us say, in enhancing the efficiency of military labor and intensifying the training process?

[Anisimov] Our academies and military schools are going over to new training plans and programs already this year. New combat training courses and new statutes on planning and holding tactical and operational-tactical exercises are being introduced in units and subunits of the categories of troops. In air defense aviation, for example, we are endeavoring to enhance the efficiency of literally every flight hour by packing it with training elements. On the ground, in turn, computers and video equipment are taking on an ever-greater load. With the help of computers it has been possible to optimize the use by flight crews of air weapons and target drones in combat shooting. The task now is to raise the standard of training of leadership personnel at the regiment-combined unit level by means of targeted retraining. Micro- and mini-electronics are held in esteem in the surface-to-air missile forces. Particularly in the specialized training centers, which make it possible within a short time not only to study several models of arms at once but also to train crews to operate them....

[Kashin] As one of the troops, I am prepared to confirm this from my own battalion's example. There is a shortage of people in connection with the boycott of the Army draft in certain republics. Therefore it is only possible to resolve the former tasks with fewer forces by intensifying military labor and the training process. Including the help of the training centers through which all of my subordinates have passed. It would be good if officers, ensigns, sergeants, and soldiers actually engaged in combat training, rather than administrative work [khozraboty]. Unfortunately, there is a lot of talk about this, but little progress. We officers of the troops are

concerned that the implementation of the military reform is unjustifiably protracted. There are virtually no changes "down below."

I would not like to guess at why the law on defense is taking so long to appear. And yet such negative processes as draft boycotts, evasion of service, and others are largely due to the lack of a clear-cut legislative base.

[Dubrov] This is evidently what must be borne in mind here. Of course, we would all like the transformations to proceed more quickly. But such cardinal changes in the troops' life and service are not accomplished overnight, however much we all wish for this.... As regards changes in the structure and formation of air defense, they have already become a reality. Take such an important element as control organs. Here the reform is proceeding in two directions. The first is the reduction in the number of control organs by means of reorganizing and improving their structures. The second is the reduction in the number of air defense large strategic formations and combined units, as dictated by the future reduction of Air Defense Forces as a whole by 18-19 percent.

But this is what must definitely be remembered. The experience of the war in the Persian Gulf zone showed that success can only be achieved with the strict vertical subordination of all troop control organs in fulfilling the command's decisions. I am in favor of reducing control organs. But, if their reduction takes place without a simultaneous increase in the pool of automated control systems and their modernization and introduction into the troops, this will have a negative effect on combat readiness. This is why it is quite impossible to agree with the opinion of the authors of certain articles in the mass media, who try to adapt the control structures developed for the national economy to military conditions.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Alas, another problem has appeared recently, which has not yet been mentioned here but which must be reckoned with. The point is that certain republics, in violation of the USSR Constitution, are creating their own national armies and customs services on borders and declaring a monopoly on the ownership of airspace. And yet extraterritoriality is of exceptional importance to the Air Defense Forces. How is this fundamental principle of military building seen under the new conditions?

[Litvinov] An age-old folk proverb was proved by the results of the referendum, when 76.4 percent of participants voted for the preservation of the USSR as a unified state with a unified Army: It is easier to resolve difficult tasks as a united family, all together, as the saying goes. It was precisely this that helped our state to survive and hold out during the bad years.

It is noteworthy that even those countries whose example is particularly valued by our opponents are also creating collective security systems, including unified air defenses. There is the combined NATO air defense system in Europe and the air defense of the North American continent.

I personally have seen how this is done. Last October, as a member of a military delegation, I visited a command post of NORAD [North American Air Defense Command], from where joint control of the U.S. and Canadian air defense forces and assets is effected.

At the same time the well-known events in East Europe have resulted in the elimination of the Warsaw Pact states' unified air defense system. But some of our former allies are already expressing a wish to conclude bilateral treaties with the USSR and with each other. Measures for mutual security are also being taken in the Far East for flights of aircraft close to the state borders of the USSR and the United States.

In our country the Air Defense Forces were created and have been improved as a unified comprehensive system to defend the country and the Armed Forces against strikes from the air and from space. This system starts at the forward positions of the USSR, is echeloned in depth, and has a ramified control system. A compulsory condition is the ability to concentrate efforts in various areas. Here defense has to be provided for all the republics, their administrative-political centers, industrial regions, power generation facilities, communications centers.... These tasks can only be resolved with unified, centralized military control. Splitting up air defense among republics and regions would sharply reduce the efficiency of the combat use of its forces, deprive it of maneuverability, and in individual cases reduce its potential practically to zero.

Abandonment of the principle of extraterritoriality would also result in the elimination of the most important defensive systems to warn of a missile attack, elements of which are deployed around the perimeter of the USSR's territory in various republics, and function as a unified complex.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] It turns out that, of all the branches of the Armed Forces, the Air Defense Forces have ended up, as it were, in the most difficult position. On the one hand, there is uncertainty as to science and appropriations, and there are proposals to eliminate them altogether as an independent branch of the Armed Forces. On the other hand, there are attacks in the radical press, accusing them, in one case, of not downing Rust and, in another, of... downing the Boeing. On yet another hand, there are problems of manpower acquisition, rearmament, and cooperation with the local population in areas of interethnic conflicts. And yet no one makes any allowances for this in resolving alert duty tasks....

[Tretyak] True: A tight knot has been tied. And yet I would not overdramatize the situation. The Air Defense Forces have been and, I will emphasize, will remain permanently ready troops. This is the chief point. Hence the corresponding demands on them and their being equipped with all they need. Whether we want this or not, we must keep up with the "age." How? It is true that we do all we can to preserve aging hardware and arms

and to maintain them at the appropriate level. But this will not get you far, as the saying goes. Of course, we also have the most modern hardware which, as you yourselves understand, has no need of any special publicity. For example, the highly maneuverable Su-27 and MIG-31 fighters, the long-range and intermediate-range multichannel surface-to-air missile systems, and the three-dimensional jamproof radars. It is important that the proportion of these should increase among the troops.

However hard this may be, we do not intend to cease research work on the creation of promising defensive means. For example, radars for early warning of an air attack, long-range interceptors, and highly mobile surface-to-air missile complexes. We also hope that the measures being taken in the country to stabilize and develop the economy will prevent us from losing the level we have attained in military science and in the introduction of the latest technologies.

[Akchurin] We military people, above all, should always remember the lessons of 1941. These are different times. However, the foreign policy situation still does not give any grounds for a placid mood. Take any question—political, economic.... Everywhere, before helping us, they demand, as a rule, some concessions from us and lay down conditions advantageous to themselves above all. And yet it is not far from there to diktat.

I will emphasize: Like any Soviet person, I am resolutely opposed to military confrontation, and I advocate mutual concessions and broad accords. But on conditions equal for both sides. What do we see in practice? The NATO bloc has not broken up following the Warsaw Pact's self-disbandment. What is more, some of our former allies have gotten the idea of joining it. And what is happening on our borders? The number of flights by reconnaissance aircraft has fallen somewhat. But there are still very many of them. Here are the figures. During just one week in March, 194 antiaircraft missile battalions were placed on alert condition 1 to stop possible airspace violations. These too, unfortunately, are the realities nowadays.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] There must be no haste in such an important matter as formulating the concept of building air defenses in keeping with the demands of the new defensive doctrine. An objective, comprehensive assessment of the foreign policy situation is needed. But changes—considerable ones—are in evidence in the world. So, taking this into account, would it not be better to channel some appropriations not into the production of hardware and arms but into improving the social and domestic conditions of officers and ensigns and into building accommodation?

[Startsev] Clearly, there is a need for this. There are decrepit barracks in many units, and officers live in condemned houses. Sometimes there are insufficient funds even for cosmetic repairs to them. Although there is now a possibility of equipping some radiotechnical subunits in the Kuriles. But the same thing is awaited in Vladivostok, Komsomolsk-na-Amure, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy....

As regards saving funds, sometimes we ourselves are manifestly improvident. We have an extensive pool of old radars. Why is it that only subunit commanders tackle the question of extending their service life? Industry forgot about them long ago and does not produce spare parts, tools, and accessories kits, and hardware that is still perfectly maintainable stands idle. But new hardware is expensive, and industry's potential is finite.

Or take this example of "savings." There was a helicopter transport detachment in our combined unit which was successfully resolving many questions of combat readiness and of ensuring vital activity. It has now been disbanded. But there will be no saving. Questions connected with transport will have to be resolved just the same, and they will be. However, what price will the company and battalion commanders and, in the final analysis, the state pay for this?

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] I would like to end our discussion with a question which, as the mail attests, is of interest to many KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers. In what way will air defense develop in our country and in other countries over the next few years?

[Dubrov] Many debates are now centered on the question of how many branches of the Armed Forces we should have and whether the Air Defense Forces are needed as an independent branch. And here, as a rule, there follow references to foreign experience. But let us investigate why the United States, for example, does not have air defense as a separate branch of the armed forces. It does not because there are no bases on its borders from which a raid or an air attack can be expected. That is, the United States simply does not need air defense as a system. It manages with fighter aircraft and early-warning radar posts.

The situation in our country is totally different, since a large number of offensive air weapons is located in the immediate vicinity of the USSR's borders. The U.S. Air Force elements at forward airbases alone includes more than 1,700 combat aircraft (over 1,000 in the European zone, 100 in the Near and Middle East, and more than 600 in the Pacific zone), and it could be significantly reinforced at any moment. In addition, the U.S. Navy has 15 aircraft carriers and 99 surface ships and submarines—which carry "ship-to-shore" cruise missiles—capable of operating in maritime regions off the USSR's borders.

Nevertheless, the United States is reconsidering its attitude to air defense and has set up a strategic air command which, while not being an independent branch of the armed forces, practically fulfills the task of one and has a system of NORAD command posts and space- and ground-based reconnaissance assets. Work has been going on since 1986 on the "Air Defense Initiative"

program (in the United States it is called "ADI"), which provides for a multiechelon air defense system for the North American continent....

[Tretyak] What conclusion can be drawn from all that has been said? First of all, I wish to thank the participants in the debate for their interesting suggestions and sensible advice. They will be taken into account. The concern with which they have been advanced attests that we are all equally concerned about the aforementioned problems of strengthening the country's defense capability—problems which undoubtedly must be resolved.

And the second point. Like the whole world, we saw how, during the war in the Persian Gulf zone, the aircraft of the multinational force struck a massive blow primarily against Iraq's centralized air defense control system. The desire of the opposing side to destroy the air defenses above all clearly shows the increasing role of this branch of troops not only in wartime but also in peacetime. It is inadmissible not to take all this into account in military building.

Cabinet Allocates Food for Officers, Families

PM2806103891 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "At the USSR Cabinet of Ministers"]

[Text] With a view to improving food supplies for officer personnel of the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the USSR KGB, and the railroad troops who are not entitled to receive food at the state's expense, and also for the families of servicemen living in the Baltic and Transcaucasian republics, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has allocated to the USSR Defense Ministry the following additional amounts for the second half of 1991:

9,700 tonnes of meat and meat products (in meat equivalent), 49,500 tonnes of milk and dairy products (in milk equivalent), 2,900 tonnes of vegetable oil, and 4,300 tonnes of sugar, out of the USSR Government reserve;

13,900 tonnes of edible fish products, including canned fish, by means of reducing the market allocation to specific consumers.

The USSR State Committee for Purchases of Food Resources, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Trade are instructed to ensure the delivery to the USSR Defense Ministry of the said volumes of food products in an appropriate product mix.

The USSR Defense Ministry, in conjunction with the USSR MVD, the USSR KGB, and the Main Administration of Railroad Troops, are to determine the procedure for issuing for payment, per person per month, these and other products on the basis of the resources available to the said ministries and departments.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council Leaders Meet in Riga 28 June

OW0107040491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1100 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Baltic Council is holding another of its sessions in Jurmala near Riga, June 28.

Attending the session are the parliament heads of Latvia and Estonia—Anatolijs Gorbunovs and Arnold Ruutel—and Lithuania's deputy head of parliament Ceslovas Stankevicius. The chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet Vitautas Landsbergis is paying a visit to France. The session also includes the three prime ministers Edgar Savisaar, Ivars Godmanis, and Gedeminas Vagnorius.

Our BF [BALTFAX] correspondent reports that the agenda includes questions of economic cooperation between the Baltic republics.

A variant of such cooperation has been prepared by the Latvian Premier Ivars Godmanis. In an interview with the press, he explained that the Baltic Council will discuss specific proposals on finance and banking, also questions of property, jurisdiction of enterprises, and a system of mutual settlements for supplies.

I. Godmanis advocates, among other things, a clearing system in trade with USSR republics.

Provided an agreement is reached in Jurmala, the proposals of the Baltic republics will be sent to Moscow for the USSR leadership's consideration, said the Latvian premier.

Before the opening of the Baltic Council's session, the Latvian Supreme Soviet's Chairman Anatolijs Gorbunovs evaluated positively the session of the European Parliament in Helsinki, June 27, which considered the Baltic question.

A. Gorbunovs announced that Europarliament undertakes to mediate between the USSR and the Baltic republics.

Savisaar Briefs Council on Pavlov Talks

OW0107055791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On June 28 the heads of parliaments and governments of the Baltic republics (with the exception of Lithuania whose delegation is led by the 1st Deputy Chairman of parliament Ceslovas Stankevicius) took part in a regular session of the Baltic Council in Jurmala (Latvia).

Upon the opening the Latvian delegation suggested entering in the agenda the question of economic relations of the Baltic republics with the Soviet Union and presented to the Baltic Council a draft document addressed to the USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The document entitled "On the Economic Relations between the Latvian Republic and the USSR" presented by the Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis outlines these relations at the government level. It contains 5 principal clauses—mutual supplies of goods and services, finance, banking, customs control, and questions of property on the territory of the Baltic republics.

All the participants of the session have recognized a need for coordinated action in forming economic relations with the USSR.

Estonia's Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar informed the members of the session on his recent talk in Moscow with the USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov who said that the Soviet Union will conclude with each of the six republics refusing to sign the Union Treaty a bilateral treaty for one year. In these conditions, said E. Savisaar, the Baltic republics could support some basic points of the USSR Cabinet's anti-crisis programme for the transition to market.

The Estonian delegation submitted to the Baltic Council its own variant of "Economic Relations with the Soviet Union". The participants of the session agreed it better presented the common position of all the republics while taking into account the peculiarities of each.

Decision on Economic Relations Adopted

LD2906064691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Excerpt] General principles for the economic relations between the Baltic states and the Soviet Union were adopted at the Baltic Council meeting here today in Jurmala.

This document has seven sections. It notes that the economic processes within the Baltic countries will take place in accordance with the laws of each state. Interstate exchanges of goods and exchanges of goods with the Soviet Union will be mutually useful and will be based upon free trade principles. Bilateral agreements with the Soviet bank will determine the order of currency circulation during the period that the Soviet ruble is used in the Baltic states.

It is also noted that all enterprises are located within the territory of the Baltic countries are under the jurisdiction of those countries.

The document provides for the participation of Baltic state representatives in the work of the Soviet Union economic organizations, under a special status arrangement, while every state bases its economic relations with the Soviet Union on the principles designated within this

document, with consideration given to the republic's economic and social processes.

Today's Baltic Council meeting included the participation of the parliamentary chairmen of Latvia and Estonia, Ceslovas Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, as well as the prime ministers of all three Baltic states. [passage omitted]

Main Points of Economic Ties Detailed

OW0107043591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1930 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At the Baltic Council's [BC] sesion in Jurmala (near Riga) on Friday, the leaders of the three Baltic republics adopted "Coordinated Principles of Economic Relations with the USSR." The document contains 7 points:

1. Economic, including intereconomic, processes on the Baltic states' territories will be regulated by the laws in effect in these states. During the transitional period, customs services in the Baltic republics will use the customs legislation of the USSR in respect to the Soviet goods flowing through the Baltic region's territory.

2. Exchanges of goods between the USSR and the Baltic states will be based on mutual benefit and the general principles of free trade. Mutual payments will largely take the form of bilateral clearing. Clearing balances will be regulated through coordinated procedures.

3. Financial relations between the USSR and the Baltic states will be based on mutual participation in joint programs.

4. As long as the Baltic states use the ruble as their internal currency, the circulation of money will be regulated on the basis of bilateral agreements with the USSR State Bank.

5. The Baltic states will ensure reliable social protection for their citizens. The provision of pensions and social security guarantees for citizens of other countries will take place, and ensuing financial problems will be dealt with, on the basis of widely accepted international principles.

6. All economic facilities on the territories of the Baltic states will be under the jurisdiction of these states. All financial and property disputes may be dealt with by special arbitration commissions set up by agreement between the two sides.

7. Baltic state representatives may participate, under a special status, in the work of economic bodies in the USSR. The Baltic states will base their economic relationships with the USSR on the abovelisted principles with due regard for the specific features of the socio economic processes in each state.

The Baltic Council issued a statement concerning the attack by Soviet armed units on the telephone exchange in Vilnius. The document says that Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia condemn the act of violence carried out by the Vilnius OMON (special police) on June 27 and warn that the full responsibility for actions of this kind will rest with the Soviet Union.

The BC session was attended by the Latvian and Estonian heads of parliament Anatolijs Gorbunovs and Arnold Ruutel, the deputy head of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Ceslovas Stankevicius, and the three Prime Ministers—Ivars Godmanis, Edgar Savisaar and Gedeminas Vagnorius.

Backdrop to Savisaar No-Confidence Vote Noted

PM2806131591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 p 2

[G. Sapozhnikova report: "We Will Topple the Present Government, and the Next Three as Well.... Estonian Government and the Narva Problem"]

[Text] When it was all over, when the clouds which had gathered above Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar's head drifted away and he was able to go off in pursuit of his business noticeably cheered up, Government Press Attache Sergey Chernov emerged from the hall and said in a dignified manner: "This appears to have been already the seventh government crisis...."

The current Estonian Government will go down in history, if for no other reason, for the fact of having constantly teetered on the brink of a crisis from its very first day, before Edgar Savisaar had barely had time to settle in the premier's seat. From that very moment someone has been periodically trying to unseat the government. On this occasion there did not even appear to be any specific reason. Then suddenly, at the end of last week and at the last Supreme Soviet session before the summer recess, 26 parliamentary deputies, well-known and respected politicians (who were immediately dubbed the 26 "Estonian commissars"), raised the question of a vote of no confidence in the prime minister.

That set the ball rolling! The people who had almost forgotten what a political rally was, were out in the square again.

The group of "26" comprised—apart from rural representatives dissatisfied with the crazy food prices and low procurement prices, and Christian Democrats who suddenly perceived pro-Moscow sympathies in the premier's conduct—also republicans, liberals, and independent democrats. The leader of the latter, Deputy Ulo Uluots, motivated the need to replace the premier in general like this:

"This should have been done long ago, seeing that the gulf between the government and the Supreme Soviet has become so wide of late that this is hampering normal life in Estonia. It is not the government as a whole that is

to blame for this, but specifically the personality of E. Savisaar. He is excessively authoritarian, highly confrontational and uncompromising, and it is impossible to conduct policy without compromises.

"Second. Governments should attend to the economy and its management, meanwhile ours is engaging in politics."

"There have been many crisis situations which could have been used to replace the premier. Why have you decided to do this precisely now?"

"The last straw was the Narva issue."

The problem of the northeastern cities, populated mainly by Russians, has been in existence as long as the wave of national revival in Estonia. As soon as something closely involving the national issue happens in Tallinn, the question of the autonomy of the northeast and its incorporation in Leningrad Oblast is raised. The result is this: Narva does not recognize Estonian laws, it merely pays the taxes under these laws.

Then suddenly capitalism burst in on our country, and it became known that Ivangorod is about to become a free economic zone. Ivangorod and Narva are essentially one city on the opposite banks of a river, linked by a bridge. And essentially the two cities have also lived as one. Therefore, quite naturally, in conjunction with the promised future introduction of capitalism in Ivangorod, the question of the establishment of a free economic zone in Narva also arose. The government of E. Savisaar who, despite all the complexities of his character, is a very far-sighted and intelligent man, submitted a well thought-out outline plan for this to the Supreme Soviet. It made provision for everything. And most important of all—the inhabitants of Narva with their ancient fortress no longer appeared keen to join up with Russia, they seemed entirely happy with the prospect of life in the free economic zone which the Estonian Republic was promising them. So this is not where the problem lay. It was Tallinn City which became nervous.

The essence of the protest in human terms: "Could it be that Narva would suddenly live better than Tallinn?"

The essence of the protest in political terms: "Narva will grab all the hard currency investments it can, and join up with Russia all the same."

Basically, the Supreme Soviet did not endorse the plan for the establishment of a free economic zone in Narva.

Bo Krag, the Swedish economic adviser who has recently started working officially for the Estonian Government, returned to Tallinn a few days ago. And he simply could not understand why Estonia is voluntarily declining a profitable and tasty tidbit in the shape of the Narva economic zone. But we locals understand everything perfectly: How can Soviet people, even in an independent republic like Estonia, put up with someone living better than they? No way.

In order to replace the prime minister, 53 votes are needed. The "26 Estonian commisars," plus 26 potential allies—Russian-speaking deputies, plus the support of the speaker or deputy speaker—and the matter is wrapped up. And suddenly such a comedown! The Russian deputies, who only five months ago were clamoring for the resignation of the premier, have mysteriously lost their voices. They are refusing to give the green light without guarantees of a quota in the coalition government. Naturally, no one has given them such guarantees.

The question of a vote of no confidence in the premier has been postponed until August at the request of its authors.

According to eyewitness accounts, after the latest attempt at a coup d'etat had failed, E. Savisaar entered the square, which by that time was filled with his supporters, and noted an interesting historical coincidence. Notably, that the 26 Estonian politicians had signed their message 14 June (everyone remembers that the Stalinist repressions against the peoples of the Baltic republics started on that day 50 years ago) and by doing so they, as it were, continued the black deed launched by Stalin and aimed against the Estonian state.

That is what he said. And according to the accounts of the same eyewitnesses, the people believed the prime minister.

...None of this would be too serious: Our compatriots have treated us to a display of a brilliant example of parliamentary diplomacy. There is only one circumstance which is causing concern. The following has been proven: As soon as someone in the Estonian Republic needs to rally the people (and, naturally, this will now become topical again) the "Russian card" is played and the Estonian people suddenly forget their squabbles and embark jointly on seeking (and finding!) the common enemy. Incidentally, this is invariably how all the nationality problems in Estonia are born.

To avoid this, here is an insistent plea: Do not send us, at least until September: a) tanks, b) OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment], c) assault troops, d) lovers of romantic adventures on the Estonian border. The lilac is currently blooming here and everyone is friends.

Savisaar Meets Swedish Transport Minister

LD2706091791 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Excerpt] Estonia celebrated Jaanipaev [public holiday] today but our prime minister was working.

The prime minister met Georg Andersson, Swedish minister of communications today. The joint Via Baltica project [road from Scandinavia into central Europe via the Baltics] was under discussion as well as possibilities for the development of transport connections between Sweden and Estonia. Taking part in the meeting were

Tiit Vahi, minister of transport of the Republic of Estonia, and (?Akan Tamm), Tallinn branch consul of the Swedish Consulate.

Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar received a delegation from Sverdlovsk Oblast Executive Committee, led by (?Rafael Gabitov), councillor for foreign relations at the Executive Committee. Possibilities for developing cooperation in the spheres of the economy and culture between the Republic of Estonia and Sverdlovsk Oblast were discussed. The meeting took place within the framework of events in preparation for the upcoming visit to Sverdlovsk by a governmental delegation of the Republic of Estonia. The visit has been planned for the beginning of July. [passage omitted]

Estonia's Ruutel Views Baltic Issues

LD2706212391 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Interview with Arnold Ruutel, chairman of Estonian Supreme Soviet, by Gunnar Paal, in Kiel on 24 June—recorded]

[Text] [Paal] Here, in Kiel, during Arnold Ruutel's meeting with FRG politicians and journalists, an important issue has come up on the agenda: How should the issue of Estonia and the Baltics as a whole be dealt with? One cannot indeed forget about any one year of what followed after 1939.

[Ruutel] The Baltic issue has in essence been the key issue during these days here in Kiel in political circles not only here in the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein; the country's top politicians have also arrived here, by way of various parties, for the period. And I have had meetings here with delegations of all Nordic countries: We have conversed both as groups and individually. When on quite a few occasions the program has contained—as a matter of general interest—the issue of minorities in different countries, then these issues inevitably have all ended up with Estonian problems. Naturally, I have all along been viewing the problem as a problem from the point of view of the Baltics as a whole. So that the Baltic issue has indeed been very seriously on the agenda during these few days.

Second, we have discussed predominantly economic questions: If Estonia becomes truly independent, how will it in real terms be possible to settle economic relations with the USSR, and everything related to this? There has been less talk of military-strategic matters, but much as has been said about this, there is no understanding of a future security system in Europe if the militarized territory of the Baltic states is rigidly fit into it.

[Paal] You also had a meeting with Bjoern Engholm prime minister of the Schleswig-Holstein federal state. This man is a rising star in the German political firmament.

[Ruutel] Yes, I had a fairly lengthy conversation with him. Our talk veered toward the possible creation of a council for the countries on the Baltic, whose main aim would be to regulate economic issues. Belonging in it would be the Nordic countries, the Baltic states, Poland, Germany and perhaps the Russian Federation, as some kind of a regional representation.

Estonia Abolishes State Prices for Food

LD2906075191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] By decision of the Estonian Government, state prices for foodstuffs are being abolished starting on Monday, 1 July. They will be replaced with free market prices. For instance, a kilo of cooked sausage with purely nominal meat content is going to cost between 17 and 22 rubles. A kilo of butter is to cost more than 20 rubles. These figures do not include the 10 percent turnover tax that the purchaser pays on every ruble spent. You also have to add the 17 percent surcharge that the retail outlet will be charging the customer in its own favor.

Next Round of Estonian-USSR Talks 6 Aug

LD2906225191 Tallinn Radio Tallin Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Interview with Chief Estonian negotiator Ulo Nugis by Correspondent Jaan Raudsepp—live]

[Text] [Raudsepp] Today, here in Moscow, another meeting took place between the Republic of Estonia and Union governmental delegations. It should have been a next round in the talks but, Laverov's team was today particularly impetuous.

[Nugis] I have to admit that today was like a cold shower. From the very first moment, it seemed that Laverov snatched the reins and behaved like a commander at a meeting. Between ourselves, we could compare this with a Gosplan conference where the Estonian side has come to present an account. There was no longer any wish to behave diplomatically, or at least to respect the other side. I gently drew his attention on a few occasions to the fact that this is an official delegation on the Estonian side. At one point, he even snapped at me: Estonia is still part of the Soviet Union and there is no knowing how it will all end. He proposed additional items for the agenda, to be discussed today, for which we had not exactly prepared ourselves, especially since we did not consider them important. They dealt with economic relations between Estonia and the USSR in 1992, roughly according to the methods of a Union republic relating to the center.

We agreed to deal today with ownership issues, social issues and the fate of enterprises subordinated to the USSR, or what the USSR considers to be its property. There was no desire to discuss these subjects at all. In

addition, military and security issues were prepared by Mr. Lippmaa. Mr. Lippmaa was not given the floor at all. This was quite unprecedented. The leader of one side's delegation forbidding a member of the other side's delegation to take the floor. In a word, the USSR does not really wish to hold talks with us in an honest and sincere manner. Whatever way we term this process, contacts of consultations, at least within the mandate held by the delegation of the Republic of Estonia we are talking about restoring Estonia's state independence. On the basis of this meeting, I fear, there will perhaps be no decent talks in the near future.

What are our assumptions? Do we have to draw a very pessimistic conclusion from this? I think not. I assume that the center, the center of the old USSR is in serious trouble at the moment. I think that after Russia, headed by her freshly-elected President Yeltsin, who has said that he will not (?even discuss) the present draft Union treaty seriously. [sentence as heard] At the same time, we can expect that the Ukraine may take the same kind of steps. We can indeed assume that the Soviet Union and its leadership are very worried. I am even ready to guess, after yesterday's meeting with Mr. Ruutel there was nothing else left for Mr. Gorbachev to do but present serious reproaches to my colleague, Mr. Laverov. We all understood that perhaps he was given a serious scolding. He was not at all in control himself. Even his motor system and facial expressions were out of control, and his hands were shaking. We must draw but one conclusion from this: the USSR and its center are at the moment perhaps quite so weak that once they overcome difficult situation, it is possible that after a time these discussions will be much nicer than they are now. Proceeding from all this, and we had previously agreed that we were not going to allow ourselves any unnecessary whims at these talks, we did not stand up from the table, even though such a feeling came to us all. We did, however, agree that our next meeting is in Moscow on 6 August. The Soviet Union demanded that we definitely discuss economic issues. We agreed, but presented a demand of our own: to definitely discuss a historical-legal evaluation. These two matters must go hand in hand. There was agreement on that. We will see what August will bring.

Further Reportage on Reaction to OMON Activities

Troops Acted in Accordance With Decree

PM2806145391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 First Edition p 6

[Report by unidentified PRAVDA correspondent: "Where Are the Weapons Hidden?"]

[Text] Vilnius—The latest "canard" from Vilnius, which attests to a certain ideological bias rather than an independent viewpoint on the part of some journalists, has flown around the world. The OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] has supposedly seized the intercity telephone exchange.

There has been no seizure of the telephone exchange, which might have indicated the beginning of a "coup." OMON acted in accordance with the USSR presidential decree on illegal armed formations. The OMON leadership recently received a report to the effect that two light machine guns and ammunition had been brought to the exchange. They checked out and confirmed the report via their own channels. In the evening of 26 June, 20 OMON men arrived at the installation and informed representatives of the administration of the purpose of their visit and began to search the premises along with witnesses. Long-distance communications were not disconnected; they did not have specialists of that kind with them. The operation was recorded on video.

A bag was soon found in a ventilation shaft containing seven 200-gram TNT charges, 10 75-gram cartridges for various weapons systems, and a reel of safety fuse. Yet the reports said that only explosive packages had been found, although I was told by specialists that this quantity of explosive would be sufficient to blow up the entire exchange. The munitions were confiscated in the presence of witnesses. Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Prosecutor A. Petrauskas then arrived.

Administration representatives explained that the old armored safes found at the telephone exchange belong to a cooperative and cannot, supposedly, be opened for that reason. The OMON men did not force them open. They then left the telephone exchange.

The leadership of the telephone exchange did not lodge complaints. Nevertheless the atmosphere has once again begun to become charged over the incident. People have once again tried to blame the military—although they were not even in the vicinity—and the Lithuanian Communist Party. There was even the following amusing incident. Amid the crowd of idlers gathered near the exchange, someone "recognized" among the participants in the operation V. Shurupov, deputy head of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Ideological Department.

"At that time I was attending a Central Committee Bureau sitting," Valeriy Borisovich said with a smile.

Stankevicius Concerned Over Raid

PM2806153091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Nikolay Lashkevich from Vilnius and on USSR Internal Affairs Ministry 28 June briefing by Valeriy Reshetnikov in Moscow: "Reaction to the OMON Operations in Lithuania"]

[Text] [Lashkevich report from Vilnius] There has been no decline in the political tension in Lithuania over the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] operations to confiscate weapons at the central telephone exchange.

C. Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, sent a telegram concerning recent events to USSR First Deputy Prime Minister V. Doguzhiyev, leader of the Soviet delegation to the talks with Lithuania, and expressed his concern.

The government information bureau stated that this provocation is another attempt by conservative forces to step up tension in the republic and disrupt democratic processes in Lithuania and the USSR. The opposition press in Lithuania also points out that the OMON actions do a disservice to the transformations in the Soviet Union. Many of the republic's mass media are making all kinds of suggestions about the objectives pursued by the organizers of this provocation: from an attempt to rehearse a coup, to the desire to damage the USSR president. Judging by the quantity of weapons found, which television viewers saw, the action of the special militia in Vilnius, as people here believe, was in pursuit of wider goals than the fulfillment of the presidential decree on confiscating weapons.

[Reshetnikov report from Moscow] A briefing was held at the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] 28 June, devoted to the Vilnius incident.

Journalists were told that on 27 June the OMON, having received information from an informant that explosives were being kept at the Vilnius Telephone Exchange building, requested authorization for a search from Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Prosecutor A. Petrauskas. The prosecutor gave his consent, and assigned three prosecutor's office investigators to conduct this delicate operation. Since the informant had indicated the precise location of the munitions, the investigators and OMON men did not spend long looking for them. The confiscation of TNT charges, Bickford fuses, cartridges, and a homemade pistol was recorded on videotape. The station director, who was present at the confiscation ceremony, stated that he has no complaints about the prosecutor's office and OMON personnel.

A Lithuanian Telegraph Agency correspondent pointed out that the Lithuanian SSR prosecutor, who was not appointed by the republic parliament, had no right to authorize a search of the building. Valeriy Sergeyev, chief of the USSR MVD administration for legal support for the activity of internal affairs organs, replied that in such situations the role of the prosecutor should not be overestimated. The prosecutor's authorization is not required for an inspection of the "scene of an incident," which is what an illegal weapons storage site is.

On 27 June, it was announced at the briefing, USSR MVD reports contained information on some 10 militia operations to confiscate unlawfully held weapons. In various cities of the country, OMON units seized automatic weapons, machine guns, and explosive devices. But in Lithuania, the militia raid turned into an international scandal.

Minister Cables Pugo on OMON Attack

OW0107055591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1230 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuanian Communication Minister K. Birulis has sent today, June 28, a cable to the USSR Interior Minister B. Pugo protesting against the seizure by the OMON (riot police) [special purpose militia detachment] of the Vilnius central telephone exchange on Wednesday. He disagrees with the asessment of the situation given by the USSR Interior Ministry at yesterday's press conference in Moscow.

The cable states that the search of the exchange for arms was conducted, contrary to the assertion of the USSR Interior Ministry, without witnesses or representatives of the Lithuanian Interior Ministry.

"The ammunition and homemade pistol alleged to have been found had been patently planted by the OMON unit. Director of the telephone exchange J. Jagminas only saw the arms extracted out of a bag", goes the cable.

The press secretary of the Lithuanian parliament A. Ajubalis read out a statement by Jonas Jagminas at a press conference in Vilnius today, June 28. Jagminas denies the words by the Attorney General of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic Antanos Patrauskas that "he has no objections to OMON's actions" in searching the exchange.

According to the press-attache J. Jagminas says he had signed the paper certifying that had no objections "under pressure".

"Men with sub-machine-guns took me to the room where Petrauskas was and gave me the typed paper. I had nothing to do but sign it under the guns' mussles", relates the director of the telephone exchange.

A. Ajubalis informed the press that the damage caused by the attack to the telephone exchange was 86,000 rubles.

At the same briefing the results of the spring draft to the Soviet Army in the Baltic area were announced: in Lithuania it was carried out by 4.7%, in Latvia by 10.9%, and in Estonia by7.3%.

Pugo Concerned About OMON Activities

LD2806150891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1548 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] An unidentified but senior official of the USSR Interior Ministry has stated that a few days ago, Boris Pugo, our country's interior minister, expressed anxiety at the activities of the Riga and Vilnius Special Purpose Militia Detachments [OMON]. Boris Karlovich [Pugo] said bluntly: It is time to put an end to this anarchy.

The Interior Ministry official did not rule out the possibility that sanctions will be imposed against OMONs, up to and including their disbandment. This person said that since some subunits of the Soviet Army are in solidarity with the Special Purpose Militia Detachments, and units of the Union Internal Troops are unable to get the better of the black berets, it is perfectly possible that special subunits will be sent to Latvia and Lithuania from the center.

That was a report from the POSTFAKTUM agency.

OMON Commander on 26 Jun Events

LD2806142991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykwun]

[Text] Vilnius, 28 Jun—The reason for conducting the search of the Vilnius intercity telephone exchange building was information recieved by the Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON] from various sources about the weapons stored in this office. This was the information which Major Aleksey Antonenko, head of the Operations Department of the Lithuanian OMON of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, has given to TASS.

As reported, on 26 June, after receiving the sanction from the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Procuracy, the OMON personnel examined the building and removed trinitrotoluene blocks, some Bickford fuses, and ammunition for rifles. Aleksey Antonenko stated that after approximately 40 minutes a well-hidden bag containing 17 trinitrotoluene blocks, 30 cartridges of various caliber, a home-made pistol and 24.5 meters of Bickford fuse was found in the ventillation chamber of the cellar. "This quantity of explosives was sufficient to cause the collapse of the cellar ceiling in case it was ever used," he said. All this was discovered in the presence of witnesses and a video camera operator.

Aleksey Antonenko did not rule out that some weapons were kept in the locked compartments and the OMON personnel still could not get access. He has also refuted rumours that the OMON cut the telephone lines. "In my presence exchange director Jonas Jagminas unequivocally stated that he has no complaints against the OMON personnel. From the words of those who were in the building at that time, it is clear that the exchange workers switched off the lines, allegedly as a safety measure," he said.

OMON Commanders 'Seriously Warned'

LD2906154391 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—It has been officially reported here that commanders of the Special Militia Units (OMON), deployed in Lithuania, were invited to the Soviet Interior Ministry on June 28. Senior executives of the ministry raised the problem of the strict observance of laws in the OMON activities and the prevention of excesses against the republic's population and the local authorities. OMON commanders were seriously warned about the need for coordinating their anti-crime actions and the protection of law and order with the republican Interior Ministry and the public prosecutor's services.

Participants in the meeting stressed the importance of toughening control over OMON activities by the Soviet Interior Ministry and enhancing their role in the protection of rights and interests of Soviet citizens, the guarding of federal property and the unconditional observance of the Soviet legislation and presidential decrees.

Omon Role in Customs Attacks Noted

PM2606143891 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 23, 9-16 Jun 91 p 6

[Vladimir Gubarev and Grant Gukasov article "Enthusiasts Or Hirelings?"]

[Text] Moscow-Vilnius-Riga—The war over customs stations in the Baltics has again brought OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachments] into the limelight. The USSR Procurator-General has ruled that OMON's actions have been violating the law. However, the police task force is not a guerilla army. In fact, OMON is paid for by the taxpayers. Therefore, we have a right to know: does OMON serve the law, some political force, or its own purposes?

Crime. As a result of the action of armed people on the borders of Lativa, Lithuania, and Estonia, state and private property was destroyed, including 20 customs houses; people were threatened with death and roughed up. Each of the above actions is a crime under USSR law.

The participation of Riga's and Vilnius's OMON squads in the assaults has been documented.

The question is: who issued the order?

Participants. Riga's squad was rather popular at the start when it had just emerged as a force to fight organized crime. They were even called "saviours of the Republic" after they broke up an aggressive demonstration of Interfront in front of the Republic's Parliament building on May 15, 1990.

However, OMON quickly learned who was friend and who was foe. Czeslaw Mlynnik (who is said to have participated in the storming of Amin's palace Afghanistan) came to the fore and headed the "black berets" in their efforts to protect Communist Party property from nationalization. Having entered the game, OMON became nothing short of hostages to the forces involved in it.

This tendencey was confirmed after the January 1991 events. Referring to this, one of OMON said: "We would have been eliminated first had the National Salvation

Committee taken power then." His words are not far-fetched, considering the fate of Roehm's storm troopers.

Attitudes. The governments and parliaments of Latvia and Lithuania regard the gutting of customs stations as an act of aggression and international terrorism.

But until the "black berets" enjoy the privilege of exterritorialtiy (they have been attached to the 42nd Division of the USSR ministry of the Interior Internal Forces) Republics can do nothing against them without conflict with the USSR central authorities and the Baltic Military District of the USSR Armed Forces with headquarters in Riga. Riga's OMON is even supplied through military channels.

In its actions OMON proceeds from the USSR President's decrees about deblocking bridges and auto routes and about disarming illegal armed formations. Boris Pugo said that the actions had been carried out without corresponding orders from the USSR Ministry of the Interior.

Credo. Boleslav Makutinovich, commander of Vilnius's OMON, said during his meeting with US legal experts: "We are not subordinated to Boris Pugo—he has enough concerns of his own. We are given orders and supplies by one of the division of the USSR Ministry of the Interior. Sometimes we act on our own accord but within the framework of the laws of the USSR and the Lithuanian SSR."

Makutinovich said in an interview for MN: "Pugo's statement was true to fact. Pugo didn't receive this information in time due to a lapse in the ministry's information service."

May 30, after the central authorities distanced themselves from the actions of OMON, shots were fired once again.

Figure in the shadows. Col. Nikolay Goncharenko, Interfront movement activist and a key figure, until recently remained in the shadows. In late April or early May the USSR Ministry of the Interior detailed him to contact OMON in the Baltics. "Black berets" mention him as their direct superior in command. It was he who, according to information from Lativa's Ministry of the Interior, issued Riga's OMON with the order to storm traffic police headquarters on May 22. The emissary of the USSR Ministry of the Interior is constantly travelling between Riga, Vilnius and Moscow. Goncharenko said that he had departed to Moscow before the operation against customs stations was launched.

Being a link between the USSR Ministry of the Interior and OMON detachments in Riga and Vilnius, Goncharenko couldn't be in the dark about the planned raid on customs offices. It is highly improbable that he could suppress an important piece of information like that and fail to report it to his superiors.

But now top figures at the USSR Ministry of the Interior deny knowledge of OMON's plans. However, Czeslaw Mlynnik, head of Riga's OMON, was warmly welcomed at the Ministry's 6 Ogareva Street Moscow HQ even recently. Last October he was Senior Lieutenant, in the January events he was Captain, and after an attempt on his life he was promoted to Major. A bullet slid past his ribs.

Version. There are at least two versions. Version One: OMON was acting spontaneously. But then the role of Col. Goncharenko in officially representing the USSR Ministry of the Interior is rather dubious. Robin Hoods with military insignia don't seem frightened by the prospect of investigation of their crimes. Perhaps they count on protection from those who unofficially sanction their actions, whoever they may be.

Version Two. Several facts (for example, OMON's allusion to the presidential decree of April 12, 1991 and to certain earlier decrees as the basis for their actions) make one believe that the operation was not spontaneous but well-planned in advance. Moreover, the involvement of military servicemen gives grounds for believing that the Army command was in the know about preparations.

Context. The "war over customs stations" coincided with the second meeting in Novo-Ogarevo and preceded the Big Seven's decision about economic aid to the USSR.

Implications. While Gorbachev's role in the January 1991 events is not clear, it is evident that the President is not interested in derailing the "9 + 1" talks or in souring relations between Moscow and the West on the verge of the Big Seven meeting. But if Gorbachev has nothing to do with the recent events, then we must acknowledge the existence of a shadow center of power capable of—at least—neutralizing the efforts of the official centre when these efforts run counter to the interests of the shadow centre. What else is this shadow centre capable of?

Youth Daily Comments on OMON Actions

PM3006150591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 p 1

[Feature comprising correspondent K. Markaryan report, report prepared by A. Monakhov, and commentary by V. Mamontov: "OMON Made Contact. Contact Failed Again. 'Alarm' in the Baltic Region Once Again!"]

[Text] **Report by Correspondent in Latvia: "It Is Still Not Clear Who Commands the 'Black Berets'...."**

Compared with their combat operations on the borders, the recent actions of the members of the Riga OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] are of a comparatively "peaceful" nature. In the name of what are they being carried out?

Some of my colleagues believe that it is in order to show who is the true power in the republic. Others accuse the center of everything. This is so and it is not so. It is possible to speak with certainty of their close friendship with the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee

and of common goals and tasks. At least, neither recognizes either the Declaration on the Restoration of Independence or the republic's authority.

In my opinion, everything is quite clear here. If you recall the articles in the press by the republic's leaders disclosing that information was coming in concerning H-hour scheduled for the parliamentary vacation, it is possible to assume that the rehearsals will end soon. [Markaryan ends]

BBC: "It Cannot Be Assumed That the OMON Acted on Its Own Responsibility...."

News agencies are continuing to comment on the 26 June events in Lithuania.

Radio Liberty and Deutsche Welle have reported on French Foreign Ministry protests in connection with the raid and on the intention of the French to propose to the EEC a new discussion of the Baltic question. Landsbergis, who is now visiting France, regarded the attack as an attempt to provoke an armed conflict and to finish off the republic.

At a news conference in the National Assembly, INTERCEPT reports, citing the BBC, Landsbergis asked Western countries to provide political protection for Lithuania, for otherwise, according to him, the West will have to assume responsibility for the possible consequences. [Monakhov ends]

Our Commentary

If people say to you that the members of the Vilnius OMON are little tin soldiers in someone's political game, don't believe it.

These guys are defending justice, legality, and order perfectly conscientiously. The trouble is **how** they understand legality, order, and justice.

From an interview with V. Razvodov, chief of staff of the Vilnius OMON, after a news conference held 26 June:

[Razvodov] We do not consider our actions unlawful. We uphold USSR laws on the republic's territory. No one has repealed them.

[Journalist] And the government of Landsbergis?

[Razvodov] It is unlawful.

[Journalist] But the republic's inhabitants voted for it....

[Razvodov] You know yourself that the election results were falsified! Proof? It exists. What is there to be said here, if Landsbergis is a fascist and the son of a fascist?

[Journalist] So your logic is as follows: In acting against an illegal government it is possible to declare yourself far above the law?

[Razvodov] You are asking provocative questions! Did they shoot at you? They shoot at us! There is danger, pressure, constant provocations! Once we caught a citizen of Lithuanian descent, in camouflage fatigues, without insignia, and even the badge on his black beret was not our Army one. A drunk became mischievous in a restaurant, passing himself off as an OMON member. Is this not a provocation? These are the conditions under which we live....

[Journalist] Were a weapon and ammunition confiscated from him?

[Razvodov] No. [Razvodov ends]

...By a coincidence which one cannot bring oneself to call accidental, it was at precisely the moment when Colonel E. Ryazanov, deputy chief of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Maintenance of Public Order Main Administration, and Internal Service Colonel B. Mikhaylov, chief of the press center, as well as the specially assembled commanders of republic and oblast OMON's, were trying to convince journalists of the Soviet and foreign press that the OMON members would henceforth stop acting willfully and would do their proper job, namely preventing mass disturbances, that the events already known to readers occurred in Vilnius. While they were spending an hour reassuring us, amazing us with figures (just think, this year the OMON has detained 75,000 people for offenses!), and explaining that henceforth the Baltic detachments have been placed under the reliable control of special plenipotentiaries of the USSR MVD and that criminal proceedings have been instituted in respect of unlawful actions, lights, the telegraph, and telephones were being disconnected in Lithuania.

What was this? Incompetence? Straightforward insubordination with respect to the MVD?

From the prolix explanations of Colonels Mikhaylov and Ryazanov it is impossible to understand what happened. From the conversation with Razvodov, it is possible. It is perfectly possible.

The OMON has firmly entered our life. It is already greeting visitors at Sheremetyevo-2. After all, citizens are certainly not averse to having strong guys protect them from the criminal world. They are not averse to being assisted in the course of the struggle against natural disasters, as well as against "epizootics, major industrial accidents, disasters, and other extraordinary circumstances." But in a number of hot spots, primarily in the Baltic region, the OMON has not waited for such extraordinary circumstances.

The OMON in the Baltic region does not merely perform other people's will. It is an advanced and ideologically committed group. It is the vanguard of our political rearguard.

I do not think there is any need to name aloud the political forces which dote upon these guys. For them this is simply a godsend.

But I would not be in a hurry to blame the OMON members for everything. They simply would not stand up to it—even strong guys give in when they are morally tested to destruction: Whose side are you on, man in a black beret? When they are made to play a political role—an unenviable, punitive role. When every day (and this, too, is a fact) they get their share of spitting and name-calling—"occupier," etc. You have to invent a lofty mission for yourself in order to keep up morale: They are standing guard over the gains! Alone among the swarm of traitors, wimps, democrats, and embittered national socialists.

A country and a government which allows its soldiers to end up between the hammer and the anvil, essentially fulfilling a deterrent function, is immoral.

Doguzhiyev on USSR-Vilnius Dialogue Problems

PM2806133791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Union Edition p 3

[Interview with V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister, by V. Zaytsev; date and place not given: "USSR-Lithuania: We Support Thorough Dialogue"]

[Text] V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister and head of the delegation discussing the whole package of political, social, and economic issues with representatives of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], answers IZVESTIYA's questions.

[Zaytsev] Vitaliy Khusseynovich, to be blunt, a far from clear situation has developed over the talks. Representatives of the Lithuanian leadership claim that your delegation is unwilling to discuss the package of questions.

[Doguzhiyev] I cannot agree with that. Our delegation is the successor to the previous delegation and we are therefore not starting up but continuing the negotiating process, in the course of which the renewed delegations held an official meeting in Moscow 4 April at which it proved possible to formulate an accord in principle on talks. The purpose and principles behind these talks were agreed upon and the subject matter and procedure finalized, which was reflected in the protocol that was signed. The dates for the delegations' next meeting were agreed—at the end of April or beginning of May this year. This meeting did not take place, but the process has not broken down. I spoke to Lithuania's prime minister, G. Vagnorius, 24 May in Moscow. We agreed that the working groups would work to continue the negotiating process in the first half of June. At the working groups' 18 June sitting we proposed holding an official meeting of the delegations 24 June. This turned out to be impossible because delegation head V. Landsbergis was away on a foreign visit. We then named 1-2 July. It is up to the Lithuanian leadership.

[Zaytsev] Evidently, there are weighty reasons preventing the official delegations from meeting?

[Doguzhiyev] In my view, the public at large in our country and abroad are entitled to know what is impeding the talks, and I am therefore grateful to your newspaper for this opportunity to express my view of this problem.

Despite the fact that the negotiating process has begun, Lithuania not only has not suspended the operation of the acts that contravene the USSR Constitution and laws, but is also adopting new acts that affect the interests of the USSR, along with the economic and social rights of a considerable proportion of the republic's population, including pensioners and members of servicemen's families. These include the laws on citizenship, privatization, and the customs service, and a number of other acts. The result is that the accumulated problems are not being solved and new ones are emerging.

The continuing practice in Lithuania of political and ethnic discrimination against USSR citizens, along with the policy of moral terror and incessant threats of violence against dissenters, is not helping to create favorable conditions for talks. Tens of thousands of letters from Lithuania's residents to the USSR president, the country's Supreme Soviet and government, public organizations, and the press say this. It would be appropriate to stress that in its findings, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee pointed to the legal bankruptcy of a number of legislative acts because they contravene not only the norms of Soviet legislation but also the requirements of international law, including human rights pacts.

The basic requirement of any talks is that their participants should have mutual respect for one another. But what kind of respect can there be if the official leader of the Lithuanian delegation ventures, in countless interviews and other public appearances, to make insulting statements about the country's government and Soviet people as a whole. His statements during his visit to the United States this April and certain other recent statements represent the "pinnacle of creativity." I leave it to his conscience to answer the question of the morals and ethics of a statesman who is striving to come to the negotiating table with representatives of a "government of thieves," "a system based on lies," at a "time of atrocious fascism"—and these were the epithets that were used.

I cannot help but note that the desire to involve other states to the maximum in a solution to our internal problems at talks and the unsubstantiated attempts to compromise the USSR leadership in the international arena represent another factor that casts doubts on the sincerity of V. Landsbergis' intentions—and those of certain other Lithuanian leaders—in terms of resolving the emergent problems in a businesslike and constructive spirit without slipping into political speculation and kindling mistrust between the USSR and Lithuanian leadership.

[Zaytsev] How do things stand regarding resolving economic problems?

[Doguzhiyev] A unique situation has developed here. Lithuania receives virtually all the necessary resources, commodities, and power sources. At the same time the republic is failing to supply its output for all-Union needs and is not making payments either to the Union budget or to extrabudgetary funds.

We have frequently proposed examining this question and also defining our participation in the work of the Interrepublic Economic Commission. We have received no clear answer. Admittedly, Lithuania proposed that it take part in this commission's work in the capacity of an observer. The commission examined this question 7 June and noted that all the republics, regardless of their participation in economic agreements between the USSR and the republics, should participate in shaping the Union budget and the country's extrabudgetary funds and be represented at the Interrepublic Economic Commission monitoring the fulfillment of these agreements as equal members with equal status, rights, and duties in relation to the questions which the commission considers and tackles. That is how representatives of the republics' governments think, and references to "central diktat" are unfounded.

To go on, on the spur of the moment the Lithuanian authorities are transferring banks, enterprises, and structures that belong to the Union to republic ownership and compiling lists for privatization. There have been several cases of their restricting and interfering in their production activity and applying illegal sanctions. All this creates a tense social situation within Union enterprises' labor collectives. How are we to regard the establishment of customs posts? This ruptures the single economic space.

In general terms I can say that as yet we see no responsible approach to the resolution of economic problems and some proposals are largely designed for effect.

[Zaytsev] Statements issued by representatives of the Lithuanian leadership often advance the argument that our delegation did not have the powers to settle the questions that arise.

[Doguzhiyev] The decisions of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the president's decrees form our delegation's mandate. The talks' aims have been outlined and we will firmly cleave to them, resolving problems that arise and finding the requisite solutions.

I do not want to enter into public polemics with the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet over the interview that he gave to an IZVESTIYA correspondent, but I can say that I saw no new constructive ideas to promote the success of the coming meeting. I would like to dwell on just a few elements. V. Landsbergis raised the question of recognizing the "validity of the current USSR authority," depending on whether a treaty with Lithuania is signed or not. He casts doubt on the constitutionality of existing organs of power that have been recognized by the world community. A strange position, to put it mildly.

The idea that Lithuanians have specific rights and specific duties to other nationalities puts me on my guard and has historical associations with the recent European past.

As for the claim that "fresh provocations and conflicts are in store for Lithuania above all"—these being maybe the mildest things that are often said on this subject—you involuntarily think that some people in the republic are profiting from constantly kindling fear and creating conflict situations to cover up the policy they are carrying out.

In conclusion, I want to stress that we support serious and thorough dialogue on the whole package of questions that have arisen in our relations. If the Lithuanian leadership is indeed interested in talks, it could, by its practical actions, remove the barriers that are preventing these talks from beginning.

It has sufficient means and potential to find mutually acceptable solutions to all the questions under discussion in a spirit of goodwill.

Vilnius Official on Doguzhiyev's Pressure

LD3006080391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2130 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] The press representative of the Lithuanian Parliament has qualified the interview with the Soviet vice-premier, Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, which was released by the TASS news agency, as growing diplomatic pressure. As the Soviet deputy prime minister had put it, the Lithuanian leadership was wrong to say that the Soviet delegation was not ready to conduct talks with Lithuania and didn't have the necessary authority to do that. He maintained that the present negotiating delegation of the Soviet Union had taken over all authority from the previous one, which was headed by the former premier Nikolay Ryzhkov. The Parliament's press representative pointed out that if it were true the Lithuanian Party wouldn't have to repeatedly ask for working and expert groups to be formed. The Soviet Union promised to appoint groups of experts during the meeting held on 18 June, while a working group was formed only on 13 June, following more than two months of promises.

Meanwhile, the former negotiating delegation of the Soviet Union had already appointed such group. The Parliament's press representative also criticized the contention that the Lithuanian leaders were allegedly compromising the Soviet leadership in the world's eyes, providing no proof. If raids on border control posts, the killing of people, and looting are not considered to be proof, the only thing that remains is a coup d'etat, commented the Parliament's press representative.

Vagnorius Sends Telegrams on Ties With USSR

LD2906074991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] According to a report received today, the Prime Minister of Lithuania Gediminas Vagnorius yesterday sent two telegrams to Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, deputy prime minister of the Soviet Union, replying to the latter's earlier telegram.

In one of the telegrams, the Lithuanian prime minister notes that [word indistinct] permanent residents of Lithuania can acquire state property in Lithuania, regardless of their citizenship.

It was noted in the other telegram that the economic changes taking place in Lithuania should not, in any way, harm the economic relations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. It is proposed that the questions of special interest to the Soviet Union could be resolved in order of procedure.

We hope that difficulties of a political nature will not burden the social and economical problems that arise between Lithuania and the Soviet Union, it is noted in the telegram by Gediminas Vagnorious.

Landsbergis on 'Political Protection' From West

PM3006144191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak: "According to the 1940 Model"]

[Text] Vilnius—ELTA has issued a short report concerning V. Landsbergis's interview in Moscow with a REUTER correspondent, which stated that "pressure from Soviet military forces can be felt constantly in Lithuania, so he is hoping for stronger 'political' protection on the part of other foreign states." If the West condemned the Soviets' behavior in the Baltic countries more sharply and if this had an effect on the granting of credits and other assistance to the Union, he noted, then the Soviet Union would finally be forced to begin talks with us. Landsbergis also spoke of how he had asked the U.S. President and other heads of Western states to make resolute statements recognizing the prewar statehood of the Baltic countries: "Although the diplomatic relations that existed during the period between World Wars I and II are more essential, even statements like that would be a significant political protection for us."

Vilnius Military Chiefs' Transfers Pondered

PM2806170191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 91 Union Edition p 5

["Rumors and Facts" report by A. Protsenko: "Changing of the Guard in Vilnius?"]

[Text] Reports have come in from Vilnius that a "complete change of guard" is taking place within the top brass here: Major General V. Uskhopchik, chief of the Vilnius Garrison, and Maj. Gen. A. Zhitnikov, commander of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] escort [konvoynyy] division stationed in the Lithuanian republic, have been transferred to other places of work. Our military correspondent N. Burbyga contacted both ministries.

The Defense Ministry Main Cadre Administration said that there is no general campaign to transfer officers and generals serving in Vilnius. But Gen. Uskhopchik has indeed been transferred to a new place of work. This year he should have entered the General Staff Academy. But his parents' health has severely deteriorated of late. The general refused the place at the academy and asked to be transferred closer to his parents. He is currently working and living in Brest.

At the USSR MVD Maj. Gen. Yu. Alekseyev, deputy commander of the Internal Troops for cadres, said that "the question of Gen. Zhitnikov's transfer to a new place of service could quite possibly have been decided. But that is the minister's prerogative. The general has been serving in Vilnius for a long time now—he has to be transferred at some time. What is more, he, too, is fairly advanced in years—that question must also be taken into consideration...."

Those are the facts. But they do beg some questions. For instance, is the Union Government's policy toward Vilnius changing along with these two generals. After all, Gen. Vladimir Uskhopchik's name did become widely known across the country and the world following the tragic events at the Vilnius television tower on 13 January this year. Criminal proceedings have been instituted in respect of the outcome of these events, but to date not only have the culprits not been tried but the judicial outlook itself has, so to speak, gotten lost in the political fog.

Presently we only have an information memorandum from USSR Prosecutor General N. Trubin to the USSR Supreme Soviet, claiming that the investigation into the case is being held up by Lithuanian prosecutor's office personnel. In turn the Lithuanian General Prosecutor's Office has issued a statement accusing N. Trubin of misinforming the country's parliament and the world public.

A great deal in this case requires a clear and unequivocal answer. For instance, N. Trubin's memorandum claims that Gen. Uskhopchik's troops were sent to the Vilnius television tower at the request of the "National Salvation Committee." The garrison chief told me personally the following—admittedly, at the end of January: "Our Army is subordinate to the defense minister alone. And the troops operate solely on orders from commanders and chiefs."

Won't the investigation subside as one of the main witnesses is moved a long way from the scene of the

event? But Gen. Uskhopchik told me then, at the end of January, that he is willing to answer all the investigation team's questions.

The broad public is less familiar with Maj. Gen. Aleksandr Zhitnikov's name. But the Vilnius OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] is under his operational jurisdiction. It is Gen. Zhitnikov's men who safeguard Communist Party property in Lithuania. It is also Gen. Zhitnikov's men who are refusing to admit Vilnius television journalists to the television center and television tower.

Incidentally, the recruitment of new television center and television tower personnel has been announced in Vilnius. And the Communist Party leadership has decided to use the Press House seized back in January to earn revenue: Independent newspaper editorial operations expelled six months ago have been authorized to return, provided that they conclude contracts to lease the premises that they occupy.

RSFSR

28 Jun RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

LD2806220891

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1930 GMT on 28 June carries the "At the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session" program on proceedings at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, session in the Kremlin on 28 June.

The program opens with Khasbulatov introducing Silayev and asking him to speak about the USSR Cabinet of Ministers decision of 15 June on socio-economic development during 1992. Khasbulatov says he himself has already spoken a bit about this. It is an alarming development. Silayev mounts the podium. At 1934 GMT Silayev says he has been empowered by the RSFSR Council of Ministers to make a statement on the USSR Cabinet of Ministers decision of 15 June.

Silayev talks about previous arrangements which suited every republic. But the new decision by the cabinet has upset these arrangements. He speaks about the cabinet's proposals on taxation. They will reduce profit earned in Russia by 40 percent. Some enterprises will be rendered loss-making, especially ones that work with fixed prices. This will reduce revenue accruing to the Russian budget by an amount equivalent to the funds earmarked for agriculture this year. He says: This is why we favor a one-channel system for preparing the budget, in which the republic will raise its own taxes.

Continuing, Silayev says another totally unacceptable proposal is the deviation from the agreement that the republics would license their own products, including raw materials like oil and gold. We also object to the retention of the Gosbank's monopoly. Many provisions run contrary to the Union treaty which was published in the press yesterday. According to this the Union does not have property as such. The treaty stipulates that destatization will be implemented by the republics not in the Union. Silayev cites the example of Avtovaz. About 70 percent of Russia's assets are still held by the Union and this is plunder of Russia's assets. We will not allow this. All this undermines confidence in the Cabinet of Ministers. It could make it harder to solve the problem of food supplies. Maybe the republic will now go ahead and secure its own food supplies. Russia has already been put in an extremely difficult situation. The Union had promised to order grain and other food and fodder supplies for Russia. But none of this was done. Unfortunately, without our own hard currency, we are unable to help ourselves either. If we allow the cabinet's proposals we will be in a hopeless situation. The situation is extremely difficult, especially with the reduction in herds. Sugar is a commodity in especially short supply. We cannot meet demand.

Times have changed, Silayev says. We have the support of the people. Silayev concludes his speech at 1948 GMT.

There follow questions to Silayev. A female deputy asks for further details of the union's refusal or inability to buy grain or sugar for Russia. Who or what is to blame for this?

Silayev talks about the economic agreement with was signed between the Union and the republics. This said that since the center control all hard-currency reserves, the Union bodies would purchase food and raw materials on behalf of Russia. Silayev gives the figures for commodities which were to be bought on Russia's behalf. This is what I had in mind, Silayev says. Western partners have refused the Union credit because it fell into arrears. Therefore, the center failed to meet its obligation to Russia.

Khasbulatov adds that the promise to supply food for Russia was reaffirmed at the Federation Council.

Deputy (Surkov) asks a question about customs posts. Silayev talks about Decree 189 on customs posts. This prevents the republic from conducting its own foreign trade. I wrote to the Cabinet of Ministers asking them to rescind the decree, he says.

(Karagacheva) from Murmansk asks when the government and the Supreme Soviet will adopt a new law on economic self-sufficiency. Silayev says that all assets on Russian territory have been declared the property of the Russian Federation. But how can this be so when we are talking about denationalization and destatization. This has been discussed with the government. The wording needs to be changed. Russia's jurisdiction must be stressed. Denationalization will not be allowed without the agreement of the republican authorities. A proposal to this effect will be submitted shortly. Silayev reads the wording of the proposed motion. The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will be consulted.

Next, at 1956 GMT Isakov from the presidium says the Union Government's action cannot be approved. But will the Russian Government seek a peaceful resolution to the problem? Silayev says the government has demanded that the cabinet's decision be amended. This was a constructive course. The changes should be made as soon as possible. But nothing has been done. Silayev says that he spoke to the president yesterday about the socio-economic situation in the country. He says he expressed his objections.

At 1959 GMT the program is interrupted from the scheduled "Vesti" newscast.

The program resumes after the newscast with Khasbulatov praising the RSFSR Government's reaction to the USSR Cabinet's decision. He told Silayev that some deputies were very alarmed. Pavlov should be told to rescind the decision which exacerbates the situation. We support all reasonable decisions, but this is going too far. Silayev was shown seated in the hall. Khasbulatov recommended that deputies support the proposed draft, though one extra point has been added, advocating that the Russian government take steps to push through the agreement between the center and the republics. We want the right to license and issue quotas, he said, adding that Yeltsin has signed similar agreements with republics like Karelia. We have delegated some of our powers. Why shouldn't the Union do the same? Khasbulatov proposed that the draft decision be adopted.

Krasavchenko submitted a fourth point, terming the behavior of the Cabinet of Ministers irresponsible. The decision is adopted by 155 to 4.

Next, Zakharov, chairman of the social commission, mounted the podium to talk about a draft bill on the indexation of citizens' monetary incomes and savings. He said that virtually all income should be indexed. This includes wages, not just of those working in budgetary institutions but also in enterprises which work with fixed prices. It also applies to pensions and grants for students. It also applies to certain types, though not all types, of social benefits and allowances. Zakharov talked about the various types of allowance. These include child allowances and allowances for funeral expenses. The level of these allowances needs to be reviewed from time to time. If prices increase, these allowances must be reviewed, on a case by case basis. But they will not be indexed. All loans and securities in the RSFSR will be indexed. But the position of those who hold USSR loans and securities is a separate question. The point at issue is the level at which increases will be triggered. Five percent is the magic figure. Indexation will not follow if the increase is less than five percent. Both the union and republican plans for price reform envisage an increase in the range of commodities which are subject to regulated pricing. The situation will be reviewed every quarter. The index will be published in the ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, the official organ of the RSFSSR Supreme Soviet. Incomes of up to R380 [rubles] will be completely indexed. This will begin on 1 January next year. Above that level incomes will not be completely indexed.

He added that a difficult question is the position of citizens' savings. The average deposit in our country is about R1,200. Broadly speaking we agree with the center's proposals for indexation of savings deposits. On 2 April our citizens lost about R2 billion in savings because of the monetary reform. We intend to index this.

Continuing, Zakharov said that employees of budgetary institutions should have their incomes indexed—supported out of budgetary funds. Workers will have their incomes augmented out of the budget. Wages must be indexed. That is our proposal, he said. But there is a third group of workers who are employed in enterprises which operate on the free market. The enterprises themselves must do the indexation in this case. Agreements will be reached between the specific managements and the work force.

Khasbulatov asked whether there are any questions. There is a question from the floor about insurance. What funds are available for indexation? Zakharov said Article One says that the cash will come from contributions to the state insurance fund.

(Krivchenko) asked what happens if prices go up in one year by 70 or 80 percent? What happens in the case of people who pay higher tax rates? Zakharov said the indexed part of wages will not be taxable.

Konstantinov asked whether the commission has considered the consequences for the economy of the law. What about inflation? Zakharov responds that the aim of the law is to ease the adverse consequences of inflation, although the law itself is inflationary. It makes its own contribution to inflation. Our proposals leave some resources in the hands of the state, not in the form of cash but in natural form. Eventually we hope that partial indexation, normal indexation will help to counter inflationary processes. That's the light at the end of the tunnel. All the proposals were approved by the Council of Ministers.

The announcer said the law was passed in the first reading. The debate on the individual articles will resume before 5 July. The law on medical insurance of RSFSR citizens was also passed by 73 to 2.

A deputy talked about the situation in Yugoslavia. He asked the Supreme Soviet to consider a draft declaration of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet expressing great concern at the situation there and the loss of life. It hopes that a solution will be found without the use of force. Khasbulatov called a vote. The result of the vote was not given.

Silayev Gives Address

LD2906033691 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1933 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Speech by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Council of Ministers chairman, at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 28 June; chaired by Ruslan Khasbulatov; from the "Russian Parliamentary Herald" program—recorded]

[Text] [Khasbulatov] Comrades: As we agreed yesterday, we have today invited Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, to inform us about the Cabinet of Ministers decree No. 360 of 15 June 1991 on organizational measures for working out the production programs and forecasts for the socio-economic development of enterprises, regions, republics, and the Union for 1992 under conditions of the formation of market relations. You will recall that I also spoke a little about this when we assembled at the joint session in connection with the well-known question from deputies. The deputies really want to know what this is about. There is a certain alarm about this. therefore, if you are amenable, then let's start with the information from the chairman of the Council of Ministers. Then we will examine our issues. Do you agree? Ivan Stepanovich, please.

[Silayev] Esteemed comrade deputeis: The presidium of the RSFSR Council of Ministers has instructed me to make a statement in connection with decree No. 360 of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers of 15 June 1991 on organizational measures for working out production programs and forecasts for the socio-economic development of enterprises, regions, republics, and the USSR for 1992 under market relation conditions. I would like to make the following statement:

Immediately after the third congress of Russian Federation people's deputies, the Council of Ministers, executing your will, held active, persistent talks with the center, the Cabinet of Ministers, and the president on cooperation with other Union republics, on creating real conditions for the economic sovereignty of Russia, and on the possibilities of fulfilling the program for stabilizing the economy and transferring to market conditions. In spite of the difficulties that arose in the course of talks, we progressed day by day, and sometimes even hour by hour. We begin this work on 17 April of this year. Complications and disagreements arose, but we found compromises and sensible, effective solutions. We relied on the support of the Supreme Soviet, leaders of regions, and labor collectives. To a considerable degree, success in advancing was helped by the Nine plus One joint statement on 23 April 1991 and the subsequent summit meeting in Novo Ogarevo. We were given substantial hope. There was a firm conviction that we would be able to agree on all issues and obtain the necessary conditions to be able to move along the intended course. Our program, which you approved, began to develop, operate, and become part of life. Normative documents and specific mechanisms for privatization, share issues, and the development of all forms of enterpreneurial activity are being actively worked on. All of this work, I repeat, relied on the agreements reached with the center. We were convinced that in the middle of June the join action program would be confirmed.

On 15 June, completely unexpected by all of the republics, the aforementioned decree came out. We are far from being so naive as to suppose that this amounted to the cabinet, without a declaration of war, attacking the sovereign republics in the spirit of the events of 50 years ago. The decree was prepared in anticipation of the extraordinary powers that were demanded on practically the same day by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Our evaluation of the decree of the Council of Ministers is this: It cancels many principle agreements and throws us all backwards to the administrative-command methods for managing the economy. The decision practically leaves the economy of the republics and the country's economy defenseless before the administrative arbitrary rule of bureaucrats at various levels, preserving the possibility of changing the operating conditions of branches of industry and even individual enterprises at their discretion.

Here are just a few examples: The most difficult issue to agree on is the issue of the state order for 1992. On the one hand, we had the difficult lessons of the formation and realization of the state order for 1991 when, owing to the fault of the central bodies of the former USSR Gosplan and Gossnab, the republics were without raw materials or other materials, without agricultural construction and other machinery, yet there was the necessity of making the transition to market relations and creating conditions under which labor collectives could distribute a significant part of what they produce themselves. It was agreed that deliveries of products for all-Union, interrepublican, and republican needs should be set on a contract basis with republican bodies—I emphasize, with republican bodies—and only things on the list of defense products and new products of special designation agreed with the republics would go through the bodies given authority by the cabinet, for example, through those placing orders on behalf of the Ministry of Defense. This suited all the republics. It was agreed in full. In the document adopted by the cabinet, practically everything has once again been centralized for the Union bodies.

further, the Cabinet of Ministers has worked out a new system of taxation on enterprises without having it agreed, by which, regardless of the department to which an enterprise is subordinate and regardless of the type of ownership, a federal tax is to be introduced that includes expenses for the production of goods in the region of 10 percent of the finished product. What does this signify? First and foremost, this will lead to a 40 percent reduction in the amount of profit on the territory of the Russian Federation. This will lead to many enterprises

having practically no profits or will make them unprofitable, especially enterprises with a low level of profitability and a low level of mass production.

Accordingly, this will lead to the reduction of income for the Russian budget by 73 billion rubles; in other words, 23 percent of the whole budget. In essence, this sum is equal; to the sum we are going to invest into the agrarian and industrial sector from our budget. Such a way of treating the economy as one's own property, when one does not have to account for the way one manages it and does not have to consult anyone, can be continued by the Cabinet of Ministers until republics get a firm right to own and use the main resource of modern economy—finances. That is why we favor the single channel system of working out the budget of the Cabinet of Ministers. What is the major and only point that still has not been agreed in the program of concerted actions of the Cabinet and the Union republics.

I will name a couple of other absolutely unacceptable deviations from the agreement that was reached. They deviate from introducing independent foreign economic activities of the Union republics from 1 June of this year. I am just reading out individual articles from the program of concerted actions. They go back on a decision saying that the republics themselves can license all the products, including the main natural resources of oil, gas, coal, uncut diamonds, and gold. At the same time, it is written here that licenses granted by the republics should be by all means implemented by the customs. Finally, there is an agreement to form the central council of banks from chairmen of republican and Union state banks no later than June of this year. We have been talking about this for a long time. This requirement was included in various documents, but it has not been accepted as yet. In this particular document, they give exclusive rights to the monopoly of the USSR state bank over everything. We think that point No. 17 is absolutely unacceptable and is direct encroachment upon the sovereignty of the Union republics. This point makes it incumbent upon the fund of USSR state property, the USSR Economic Ministry, the USSR ministries and departments, and relevant republican bodies to make their work on destatification and privatization of enterprises dealing with relevant spheres of activity more active in the second half of 1991. First of all, according to the draft Union treaty, which was published in IZVESTIYA yesterday, there is no Union property as such. It says that state property that the Union accounts for is joint property. It is the joint property of the states that form it. Second, there is a firm agreement regarding this matter. The republics agreed that the dismantling of the state system and privatization would be carried out in the republics and by the republics.

It is possible to show what the practice of destatification and privatization by Union bodies, which has already begun, leads to by using the example of AvtoVAZ. We discover from the newspaper that this giant is being transformed through the efforts of the appropriate ministry into a joint-stock company, without republican participation, including a 40 percent shareholding by a foreign firm. If you also take into account that today around 70 percent of Russia's economic potential is in Union branch structures—I am talking about the basic reserves and the output produced by them—even 71 percent, it is possible to conclude that a result of the implementation of point No. 17 will be a final ravaging—or to be more precise—robbing of Russia.

Of course, we will not tolerate this. Evidently, in the very near future we will have to declare that everything on Russia's territory is under her jurisdiction, as the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and other republics have already done.

The unexpected rejection, without warning, of the agreements achieved at such a high level undermines trust in the policy of the Cabinet of Ministers and extremely complicates the carrying out of market reforms and transformations and may have a negative effect on the solution of the most vital problems, such as the food problem. Indeed, the aforementioned decision envisages that the republics are to provide foodstuffs for themselves. You know that the Russian Federation is as yet, unfortunately, the largest importer of grain from abroad. This state of affairs places the Russian Federation in an extremely difficult position. This year, since the end of last year, the Union committed itself to buy for us 15 million tonnes of grain and 4 million tonnes of oil seed mill for cattle and poultry. Unfortunately, neither the first or the second has happened. Sixty percent of the grain, and as regards oil seed mill for cattle even less, only 30 percent, was supplied and bought.

On the other hand, not having money, not having hard currency, we are not in a position to be able to solve the issues on our own. In the given decision, when everything, all foodstuffs, is related to the republics, and on the other hand as before everything is centralized and the republics are deprived of hard currency, we are in a no win situation if we tolerate this.

We have, it is true, taken the necessary measures. We have reported to you about them. These include the procurement of 4.5 million tonnes of wheat from Canada. We are taking other measures, but the situation is exceedingly difficult. One of the reasons is the reduction in the number of cattle. The same can be said for sugar. That is a particularly acute situation today, now that the center has been unable to fulfill its obligation to procure for us the necessary amount of sugar, or raw sugar for refining. the summer campaign for the procurement of food for the population is in full swing. At present we cannot solve the problem of fully meeting the demand.

On 20 June at the regular session of the Cabinet of Ministers, I had sharp objections to the basic provisions of the cabinet decision. I was supported by the leaders of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and certain other republics. We demanded that the given doucment be brought into line with the program of joint actions of the republics and the

center, which was, it can be said, 93 percent agreed. We were promised that this would be done. But today, on 27 June, a week has gone by and no actions have followed. This is why the presidium of the Council of Ministers yesterday examined most attentively the situation that has arisen and adopted the decision that you have in your hands.

I will nonetheless quote a few lines from that resolution. In accordance with the RSFSR law of 24 October 1990 on the validity of acts of the bodies of the USSR on the territory of the RSFSR, namely not to bring into effect on the territory of the Russian Federation decision No. 360 of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers of 15 June 1991, on organizational measures to draw up production programs and projections of socio-economic development of enterprises of the rayons and republics and of the USSR in 1992 under conditions of the formation of market relations until it is brought into line with the basic agreed provisions of the program of joint actions of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the sovereign republics to get the country's economy out of crisis under conditions of transferring to the market.

Finally, just two or three months ago, after such a knockdown, so to speak, we would have probably fallen into despair and rushed to ask for protection and help. Today times are different. We have become different. We have experience; we have confidence in the justice of our cause; we have the support of the people. There is a Russian president elected by all the people. We will cope with this forceful method. You can rest assured, we will not now fall back from the planned goal.

Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Silayev Answers Deputies' Questions

LD2906045291 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1948 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Question and answer session between Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Council of Ministers chairman, and RSFSR deputies at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 28 June; moderated by Ruslan Khasbulatov; from the "Russian Parliamentary Herald" program—recorded]

[Text] [Khasbulatov] Are there any questions for Ivan Stepanovich? First microphone.

[(Makarova)] Deputy (Makarova) from Novosibirsk. Ivan Stepanovich, after hearing your report, I would like to ask you, first, what you meant when you said the Union, or the center, was unable to buy grain, oil seed meal, and sugar for Russia? Is it not possible to ask them gently, regarding these things, to explain what the phrase we are unable means? Who is to blame for this inability? Thank you.

[Silayev] As you know, between these two years, 1990 and 1991, an economic agreement was signed between, on the one hand, the Government of the Union, of the USSR, and, on the other hand, the Union republics, on cooperation on the main economic problems, above all on food supplies. It was agreed and recorded that, since all hard currency is under central control and the republics do not have hard currency at their disposal, it was to be the responsibility of Union organs. In fact, the USSR Council of Ministers was to have the responsibility to purchase various types of food, raw materials, and other commodities. This document clearly states that central bodies would purchase for Russia 15 million tonnes of wheat, 4 million tonnes of oil seed meal, butter, sugar, and so on. It was also agreed that they would purchase about 1.5 billion foreign currency rubles' worth of raw materials and semifinished materials for the light and food industries. I had this very agreement in mind.

I know why this happened. The Union was very behind with payments. Western partners refused the Soviet Union further credit. That is why they were unable to cope with this task. I have already said that we have begun seeking a way out of this situation. That is why the agreed document clearly stated that, from 1 July, the republics would deal with these questions themselves. This has now been repudiated by the decision about which we have been reporting to you today.

[Khasbulatov] Incidentally, the commitment to import 15 million tonnes of wheat for Russia was agreed by the Federation Council. I remember endorsing this document myself, together with the other leaders of the republics. Second microphone, please. People's Deputy Surkhov.

[Surkhov] We really have just declared that we will not introduce this decree. What is going to happen about the order on customs, which states that from 1 July this huge rate is to be introduced? Yesterday we instructed the committee to call on you and the Supreme Soviet presidium to halt the introduction until a Union republic council on customs and tariffs can be set up. Of course, this is not going to come into existence today or tomorrow. How do you view making the demand at government level as well as perhaps at republican government level that order No. 189 should cease to have any effect, specifically on this issue?

[Silayev] This order on customs also boils down to the fact of the republics being deprived of the possibilities of having independent economic links with one another. Therefore, I have written a letter to the USSR president about this decree, lodging a protest and requesting that it be annulled. Regarding the actual order on customs, I am in complete agreement with your proposal. In accordance with our Russian law, on the basis of which we have adopted this decree on not introducing this, it is stated that acts relevant to departments and industries will correspondingly be introduced, or will not be introduced by our analoguous industries. We will, of course, implement yesterday's instruction. I consider that in this case, Comrade Yereshenko—it is his area—will have to adopt the relevant decree. [indistinct call from hall] This

is not important. In this document, in our law it is stated that they are effective on the territory of the Russian Federation only when, if it is a law, then it is the resolution of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and if it is a Union Government action, then it is the republican government. If it is a department or ministry, then it will be the province of the corresponding Russian department.

[Korgacheva] Okrug 507, Murmansk, Korgacheva. Don't you think that we need to speed up work on the draft law on the economic independence of Russia? If you think that this is necessary, then when will our government go to the Supreme Soviet with the initiative on the Supreme Soviet adopting such a law? Thank you.

[Silayev] Thank you. Today I have drawn attention to a number of decrees and laws that have been adopted by the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, including the law in which everything which lies on the territory of the Russian Federation has been declared the property of the Russian Federation. It is another matter how this sounds today—the property of the Russian Federation—when we are talking of removing things from state control and of providing economic freedom and independence for any economic entity in our territory.

In this regard, I personally think—and I consulted members of the government on this topic—that the way the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belorussia put this for implementation... [changes thought] and here it must be added that they are declaring jurisdiction over all the enterprises on their territory, and further they write that no actions connected with transferring subordination and transferring to another form of economic operation are allowed without the agreement of the republican leadership. I, as a matter of fact, said in conclusion that in essence we are on the border of this. We will be ready in the next few days to put forward an appropriate proposal.

I remind you of the RSFSR law adopted on 31 October 1990, which says that establishments of state property situated on RSFSR territory, including the property of state enterprises, institutions, and organizations under Union subordination, and their basic production and non-production reserves and other all-Union reserves, and property managed by all-Union bodies, are the property of the RSFSR. Therefore, it will evidently be necessary for us to consult the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet so that everything is juridically correct. If it is clear that nevertheless it is necessary to talk about jurisdiction and the forbidding of any actions apart from those agreed with us, then we will introduce such a document in the next two or three days.

[Deputy Presidium Chairman Isakov] Of course, it is impossible to approve the actions of the Union Government, which makes such decisions without the agreement of a Union republics. As I understand it, you are also proposing a forceful variant in reply. So this is what the issue consists of: Will the Russian Government use any opportunities to solve the problem without force, to find any compromise solutions to the situation without entering into conflict? Let's put it like that. That is the first issue.

The second issue is: Does the Russian president know about this situation and what is his position on the given issue?

[Silayev] Thank you. Maybe I did not say this very clearly. As soon as this decision came out, I immediately contacted my colleagues from the other Union republics. The result of the discussion was my statement at the Cabinet of Ministers session supported by a number of other republics that rejected this.

We did not only say that we did not agree and did not approve. We demanded that this document should be corrected and brought into strict compliance with the agreement that we reached over a period of two months, in the document known as the joint action program of the Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the Union republics. Therefore, we proposed a constructive course of action and asked for these changes to be made as quickly as possible. They promised that this would be done. But a week passed and no action was taken despite the requests made on our behalf by Comrade Lobov and other comrades.

I can inform you that yesterday I had a conversation with the president in connection with plans for a big meeting of leaders of the republics and the chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of all the republics, which he is to chair on 2 July. This meeting is to discuss the present state of the economy, the sociopolitical situation, and preparations for 1992. I told him that I strongly object to this. He replied that he was extremely surprised and asked how it was possible in this day and age to adopt a decision that had not been agreed with the Union republics.

Concern Over SFRY Events Expressed

LD2806173391 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—The Russian parliament has expressed concern over the developments in Yugoslavia.

The parliament of the largest Soviet republic today circulated a statement which says that the aggravated conflict in the country friendly to Russia can and must be settled by peaceful means. Russian legislators expressed regret that the incidents in Yugoslavia have resulted in the loss of life.

USSR Production Decision Rejected

LD2806102391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Now about the session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, from the White House on Krasnaya Presnya, as its premises are called. Correspondent Andrey Nikiforov is there. We are listening, Andrey you are on the air.

[Nikiforov] Hello. The morning sitting started with Russian deputies listening to a report by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. This report was prompted by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers' decision of 15 June. I will read the title: On Organizatioal Measures for Drawing up Production Programs for, and Forecasts of, the Socio-Economic Development of Enterprises, Regions, Republics, and the USSR for 1992 in Conditions of the Formation of Market Relations.

So what has caused alarm in the RSFSR Council of Ministers? Ivan Stepanovich said that the Nine plus One agreement and the Russian Government's program for solving the crisis—which, incidentally, was approved by the republican Supreme Soviet—as well as the progam for joint actions by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of sovereign republics has created favorable conditions of late for implementing the plans aready mapped out. Then, out of the blue, that decision encroaching upon the sovereignty of republics! Ivan Stepanovich supposed that the resolution had been prepared to tally with the extraordinary powers for the Cabinet which Pavlov, head of the Cabinet, had asked for literally the same day at the country's Supreme Soviet. We remember those tempestuous debates. The decision throws us back toward the administrative command system—this is the conclusion drawn [by] the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

On top of everything, that decision by the Cabinet of Ministers was adopted without discussing it or agreeing with the republics. It does not correspond in any way either with the Russian Government's program or with the program for joint actions that I have already mentioned. The RSFSR Council of Ministers has issued a decision of its own which says that, in accordance with the Russian law on the enforcement of USSR acts on RSFSR territory, the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers which I have mentioned should not be enforced on RSFSR territory until it is brought into line with the main agreed provisions of the program for joint actions of the Cabinet and the governments of sovereign republics. The RSFSR Parliament, in turn, has agreed with this decision adopted by its government, and has approved the RSFSR Council of Ministers' position defending the republic's state sovereignty.

Currently the session is examining the draft law on medical insurance for citizens. This is a second reading in the republic, an article by article discusssion is underway.

Prime Minister Silayev Discusses Economy

LD2906215991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1033 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Interview with RSFSR Prime Minister Ivan Silayev by Sergey Dorenko, place and date not given; from the "Plus Eleven" program—recorded]

[Text] [Dorenko] On more than one occasion we have seen that too much in our life depends upon the resolutions adopted by our leaders. Besides, Ivan Stepanovich Silayev is probably more aware of what is going on in Russia than many of our viewers. Ivan Stepanovich, [USSR] Prime Minister Pavlov recently characterized the situation in the USSR with a sort of oblique phrase. He made it clear that the country is still declining, but not at quite such a high speed. So at what speed is Russia falling? What have we succeeded in doing?

[Silayev] Continuing on from your question, I would like to remind you that when the so-called Pavlov program was presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet, Shcherbakov, his first deputy, said that it would be in force as early as the end of this year. Even then it was clear that this statement was over-optimistic, practically unrealistic, and that negative processes are actually going on. This cannot be otherwise. From this point of view, Pavlov is not far from speaking the truth.

It is another issue with regard to who is acting and in what way are they acting to at least halt this process of decline; then they need to work not only to stabilize it, but also develop it in a positive direction.

[Dorenko] Ivan Stepanovich, in front of me I have the Russian Government's program for the stabilization of the economy and the transition to market relations. I have read it, and it really is remarkably brief. There are a few words—guarantee, establish, privatization, the government takes as its starting point—could you briefly and succinctly tell our viewers what all this is for?

[Silayev] Well, I would like to return to what was said at the beginning. There are two approaches. The first approach is to halt the crisis by any means and at any cost. The program of the cabinet was called the anticrisis program. There is another approach. That it is, of course, necessary to stop this decline; however, this is not the end, but rather the beginning. It is necessary to revitalize the economy, normalize it, and then it is necessary to create an active economic situation so that it can pick up speed. The stated main aim of our program is just this, and if you noticed, its first section is on business activity and the support of entrepeneurship using all the means, methods, and guarantees needed for this.

[Dorenko] Ivan Stepanovich, the program is a short document. We have already repeatedly come across programs that, as a rule, have been characterized as being full of slogans or declarations. It was said that some of the program were not properly worked out. A program, of course, cannot take into account all details,

but there should be a whole series of other documents surrounding the program—people should travel, should call on the phone—that is to say, the program should live in some way, or it will just remain on paper. Is there already some sort of movement surrounding your program?

[Silayev] Yes, you see, it can be said that the fate of many programs has been to end in nothing, and their implementation has not even started because there was a certain lack of contact between the mood of most sections of society and the ideas of the theoreticians and what they were calling for. Our program today does have support. In the first place, it reflects the interests of a significant proportion of our citizens.

[Dorenko] Are you talking about the results of the elections in this case?

[Silayev] Yes, that is one thing. There is support. The second thing is that today, powerful activating processes are going on. At a meeting in Arkhangelsk, in the town of Arkhangelsk, one of our experts spoke of a part of the program which he had worked out on support for the development of business activity. Supposedly, the entrepeneurial section of our society is today still very weak, it is not professional, and it does not have funds. The vice president of business people's assembly of Russia however convincingly states that this is not the case. This section of society already numbers tens of thousands of entrepeneurs, for the most part young energetic business people with a good head on their shoulders as they say. They are carrying out their affairs fairly professionally today, and they already have funds, too. Moreover, the fund of the assembly of business people of Russia already more than 1 billion rubles, which they are ready to invest not only in their own programs but also in government programs, and in the programs of Russian leadership. They simply propose: give us a program in which we could be of assistance to you and in which we could invest. This is simply remarkable. Prior to this in state structures, directors would go to them and say: yes, yes, this is the way it has been for all these 73 years. Then suddenly they say: give us a project we could finance. Therefore, our program differs principally in the fact that if reflects the interests of a significant part of our society.

In this case, our task is not to delay the introduction of legislative, normative, documentary acts, which is what we are doing at the moment.

[Dorenko] It seems that with this question, I am going back on myself a little, but it is really interesting. Every program has its authors, and with yours, did it come into being in this office, or did you somehow gather the views of other economists?

[Silyev] When we prepared to give a report to the Congress of People's Deputies, we organized six groups. We set up in our holiday areas on the outskirts of the city called Arkhangelskoye, next to Osenko if you recall.

[Dorenko] Recently, all the most important decisions are being adopted on the outskirts of the city. There it really is peaceful.

[Silayev] Yes, so quite a large number of specialists worked there. Most of them, all the same, were young people, young academic economists, including deputies from the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, and, of course, our economists who form the basis of the economic committee and the reform commission, and two of my deputies. So six variants were drawn up, and, I would say, we amalgamated them into one, the program of the Council of Ministers. Of course, Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] supported it right from the start, both its approach and the main areas of work, and for that reason it is no coincidence that it is known as the Yeltsin-Silayev program. Also, of course, the Third Congress of People's Deputies was very right to stipulate that we should submit that program to objective, independent, expert examination. We received a large number of official findings....

[Dorenko, interrupting] From Soviet academics?

[Silayev] From academics. Moreover, I cannot say that we received a chorus of approval. There were criticisms, too, so our program came to life at that stage and was fine-tuned with reference to expert assessments. We also received a finding from the well-known professor and doctor, as we say, the famous U.S. academic, Wassily Leontief. We have all those findings.

What is more, while we were working on the implementation of the main sections of the program and were carrying out the necessary detailed fine-tuning, we invited the authors of those critiques to visit us. In particular, they worked with us at Arkhangelskoye a week and a half ago, and then we went together to the city of Arkhangelsk. They are working very actively with us. The only one who isn't, unfortunately, because he is ill now, is (Silyunin), but he has also expressed agreement and has submitted a finding. Well, he will get better.

In general, we very much hope that our economists will be actively involved in drawing up separate subprograms, putting the flesh on the bones and elaborating particular recommendations.

[Dorenko] Ivan Stepanovich, let us turn to specific areas in the program, and at the level of my understanding, for I know nothing at all about economics. How will we share it? What sort of privatization do you plan? I understand that the word destatization, which no one has been able to pronounce until now, is evidently a cunning term used to conceal denationalization. Fine, how will we share it? For example, a peasant is given the land that he occupies. Brilliant. But what can I get out of television? Nothing. Well, I can steal a wad of paper. What will I get?

[Silayev] I would divide this problem into two parts. First, there is the dismantling of state control [razgosudarstvleniye]. This is indeed confused with the concept of privatization and so forth. The removal of the enterprise from subordination to the industrial ministries—that is the dismantling of state control. The cessation of everything being centrally drawn together, of the republic being gathered in and then the distribution, through Gosplan, through Gossnab, and the transition to direct links on commercial principles on the stockmarket, that is also dismantling of state control. In other words, giving the enterprise freedom and the possibility of independent economic activity—that is the meaning of the dismantling of state control. Ultimately, it is the abolition of the structures of the various industries, in the Union and the republics, or independently; giving them economic freedom, to determine their own actions and decide for themselves the questions of how to market what they have produced. That is what the dismantling of state control is. So it remains a state enterprise, but ceases to be subordinate to any structures.

[Dorenko] But it seems they've been leading up to this since the days of Kosgyin, and now at last....

[Silayev, interrupting] There were all sorts of variations on it.

[Dorenko] Yes.

[Silayev] Including the state people's farms [sovnarkhoz]. There were those approaches to it. Privatization is something entirely different. Here there are various approaches to the aims and tasks of privatization. Here we have an approach that differs, shall we say, from the views on this subject of a number of the leaders of the Cabinet of Ministers. For example, the cabinet under Gorbachev recently heard a report. Shcherbakov made the following appraisal that we now have a bad situation with the ruble, that its exchange rate is still falling, that we have a lot of remission, that we have inflation, and that to halt this and then work for improvement, we must induce the citizens to buy this, that, and the other and collect from them the main mass of money, enabling us to stabilize the ruble and make it [words indistinct].

[Dorenko] In other words, the central government is complaining about the remissions as if it had nothing to do with them.

[Silayev] Yes, as a consequence of inflation. Whereas we take a different approach. Our task, after all, is not just how to stop inflation, how to avert a further deterioration of the economy; Our task is to activate our economy and increase production, first and foremost, of consumer goods, food, and so on and so forth. The old structures have shown themselves to be totally unsound over a period of 73 years. The absence of direct interest, the absence of concept and sense that this is mine and if I abandon it I'll at once lose 10 rubles [R], R100, or R200. I'll give you an example, one that's simply astonishingly characteristic of us.

We were in the United States recently. On the way back—we flew by Aeroflot, of course—on the way back we were told that there were no seats for three members of our delegation. This is our own Aeroflot. But no means no, doesn't it?

[Dorenko] However there were tickets?

[Silayev] We took our seats—no, there weren't any tickets. There were orders [words indistinct], but on the return journey they were all booked. We took our seats in the plane. There were five free seats in first class. Each costs R7,000—I mean dollars—making a total of 35,000. We took a look at the business class. There were 12 empty seats there. So, 100,000 was lost just like that. Yet, no one's bothered. If this had been a private company and, what's more, a private plane, this would have been regarded as outrageous and unbelievable. It only happens in our country.

So, the main aim of our approach to privatization is to create a stimulus, an incentive to work, and to enhance the efficiency of this work. This can be done only if a person is allowed to own his own property, either individually or collectively. If our state also benefits from this, so much the better.

[Dorenko] Ivan Stepanovich, Russia is such a huge country that even if only five percent of its citizens have their doubts, this is already millions of people. Many do have their doubts. They believe that some kind of bourgeois bloodsucker will grab all the property, when they themselves can buy nothing, not just at their own television station, which is loss-making and always will be probably, but at KamAZ. I can't go there and buy something because I don't have the money. At the same time there is this young class of entrepreneurs you mentioned. They do have money to spare and are prepared to invest it. [word indistinct] all the same to me who I work for, an entrepreneur or the Union Government, so long as I live well. But this does give offense.

[Silayev] Of course. Yes, it is offensive. The power that these people have is annoying. It's annoying that someone can do something I can't, and so forth. You're absolutely right. Even if it's only a few percent, this does represent, if not millions, then many hundreds of thousands of Russian citizens. So we do take them into consideration in our choice of privatization methods. You have to make a distinction between small-scale privatization—the purchase of a shop, for example, or a hairdresser's, or a bakery, and so forth—and other privatization. In this case we are not greatly in favor of giving it all away free of charge. By the way, I read in the paper the other day that some shops have already passed into private ownership. I was planning to meet these owners today, but our timetable has slipped a bit. I want to know what sort of people these are, what their outlook is, and what problems these entrepreneurs encounter.

[Dorenko] The merchant class [word indistinct].

[Silayev] Yes, there you are, you are right. I don't have enough money for vouchers either. I've got about 10,000-11,000 saved up at home. Can't I [word indistinct]? So, that's why, as far as large-scale and medium-scale privatization is concerned, that is, when we are setting up shareholding companies out of works and factories employing many thousands, or a thousand people, we are laying down the principle of alloting so-called start-off capital. This is not the principle of giveaway: It isn't handing things out for free. We don't agree with that way of doing things. We are doing something very simple: We are dividing our whole production assets by the quantity of citizens and find out who.... [changes thought] How much there is per person.

[Dorenko] Including children and babies?

[Silayev] Children, babies, and old people. For (?there is already the question) of large families and small families. If there is a large family for one worker, then even those 7,000-10,000 we have calculated mean nothing to him. So we are giving any Russian citizen the chance to have this sort of start-off capital. If in addition he already has savings, then this is in addition to that.

[Dorenko] But this isn't in cash, this start-off capital, not in cash?

[Silayev] No, it isn't. It is a personalized right to buy shares. He cannot sell them, or buy anything else. The principle here is that it shouldn't be possible to buy them up or for there to be another invasion by the black economy, the mafia. They are his personal (?papers), his and my capital. You can't get anything else for it. You can buy shares in a works, you can pay for land if the amount given you for nothing according to the relevant norms is not enough, you can use them to pay for housing if the housing you have is higher than the set norm that is also handed over free.

In this way we are removing this injustice. We are giving an initial impulse. We are giving everyone not a lot, it is true, but it is start-off capital.

[Dorenko] Ivan Stepanovich, let's assume a figure—I don't know, something palpable would be 10,000, wouldn't it?—10,000 in the form of some kind of personalized special funds that cannot be spent. So, it will be necessary to think very quickly, because all the shares of any enterprise may suddenly begin to increase in price, and then I will maybe buy a tram ticket with this 10,000, as a result of inflation. So, will this money somehow be protected, so that a certain proportion, and their value in figures means nothing with inflation. [sentence as heard]

[Silayev] You see, inflation, after all inflation....

[Dorenko, interrupting] What if I didn't realize, what if I am on leave, what if I am on a business trip?

[Silayev] I understand, I understand, I understand. Nevertheless, the value of the basic funds is no less (?rapid) as the state of the market today. This is a serious question. He has the option, having calmly looked around, of making a decision where to invest them.

This is the first, the initial, the starting point. But there is a second starting point. You know that we have stated that we will not impose an income tax higher than 30 percent. It is very good that the Union Government has already implemented our formulation as a USSR law. This is splendid. A number of people consider—well, just look, while you are thinking, the Union has already decided—but this is good. If it would resolve, in anticipation, a number of other things we have formulated—our liberation from dependency on the center for hard currency, granting us the right to act by ourselves—then we would gladly say thank you.

So, first, we are giving start-up capital to everyone, irrespective of whether they are disabled or not, whether they have small or large families, they will receive it. Those who are capable of earning by their hands, by their brains, in general in any way they may earn—we will give them the opportunity to earn without limitations by removing the harsh and, I would say, barbaric extortion in taxes from their large earnings. Thus we are creating the economic opportunity to begin the process, and this point is not under discussion here. He has this; he earned it. Another has received as well as earning, and so on, the whole logical thought process. Impetus must be given to convince and to show that this needs to be done. One should not be afraid. But naturally this is not some kind of adventure, there is of course always a risk. It really is necessary, it is necessary to start up one's own business. Our task is to convince our citizens by specific examples.

[Dorenko] There is some research by psychologists and sociologists proving that there is a direct percentage ratio of entrepreneurial people in every nation, and we should hope that we have been fortunate enough to have avoided the degeneration of this group of people, so that it might be regenerated.

You have said that the Union Government has adopted—the Union bodies, central bodies, have adopted—a resolution on taxation which anticipated your ideas, as it were, and fortunately permits them to operate. On other relations with the Union Government, I know that a joint action program exists. It is natural that, everyone, the Russian and other republican governments, are constantly arguing with the center. It is quite evident that this will not produce any good results. Such a program is necessary. How is it to be implemented? Will the Cabinet of Ministers help in the work?

[Silayev] Our program, its functioning and implementation are unthinkable in a vacuum, as it were, taken separately, as has been stated previously. It is, of course, indissolubly connected with the actions of the cabinet. This process which has passed quite successfully, especially since the joint declaration of 23 April by the heads of the nine republics and the president. This inspired very great hope and moreover, even confidence. We have already stated—Boris Nikolayevich and I—to our

citizens that we have an accord, that we are acquiring economic independence, foreign economic activity, for a council of banks of the Union republics to be organized, a bank of the USSR, and we were, virtually, very close to the signing of this very important and necessary document. Moreover, in this document, on the first or second page—it is possible to take a look—it is stated that this joint action program will help implement the economic programs of the republic. We asked for this to be noted, and it was.

Then suddenly—or maybe not suddenly—on 17 June the Cabinet of Ministers issued a resolution that in effect canceled all, or at least the main accords that had been achieved.

[Dorenko] Such resolutions are signed by the prime minister?

[Silyaev] Yes.

[Dorenko] Because the feeling is that Gorbachev, that is, the USSR president, signs some papers while the prime minister signs others, and they often don't coincide.

[Silayev] You know, we are simply shattered. By 'we' I mean the Union republics. As soon as we read about that resolution in the papers and began to see what it amounted to, we saw with horror that we were being thrown back into former times, of a centralized [words indistinct] intense, creative, painstaking work, step by step [words indistinct]. I thought we could find a solution to it, so that this document could be confirmed by the president and bear Gorbachev's signature.

Then this resolution came out, and we protested about on the 20th along with a number of Union republics. This morning I reported to our Supreme Soviet the decision of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation held yesterday. After analyzing the resolution, we gave it a negative evaluation and made the decision in accordance with the laws of the RSFSR not to bring the resolution into force in that form on the territory of the Russian Federation. We asked the Cabinet to bring the basic provisions of that decision into line with the agreements of the program for joint actions.

We are extremely disappointed. I would even say indignant, but we are not now the same people as we were when we weren't taken into account at all. A lot has been won back, and finally we now have an elected RSFSR president, which strengthens our position and our confidence. I would also cite President Gorbachev's speech on the results of the discussion on Pavlov's report to the USSR Supreme Soviet, where he spoke energetically (?and, I would say) stood up for radical reforms, for respect for sovereign republics.

The draft Union treaty that has been prepared says that it is not even republics, it is a Union of sovereign states, with all their attributes, and this allows all of us not simply to sigh and complain, as could happen and as used to happen, but to act confidently and to defend our interests. I do not doubt and can assure each person in the RSFSR that we will get what we want and will defend the interests of the RSFSR.

[Dorenko] Ivan Stepanovich, indeed the whole of the first year of the existence of sovereign Russia was a struggle, but as the elections have shown, people always believed you, they always entrusted you, and trusted your program at the most recent elections. The time has indeed now come when probably they won't be so willing to accept arguments that they are hindering the Russian Government and the Russian president. [sentence as heard] If they are in the way, then they have to be overcome, because we trust you and we are expecting results. Not immediately, but we are expecting positive processes at least. Some small (?victories).

[Silayev] Undoubtedly, and we actually do not intend appealing anywhere. Today we simply feel the strength, we feel the confidence that we will cope with such obstacles. We do not rule out that they will end in the future. Our citizens, Russians, naturally, participating actively themselves, besides moral support and, in real form, the victory of Boris Nikolayevich at the elections, of course, we rely on the support of the basic sectors and their participation in their realization, which, actually, is what is happening. [sentence as heard]

[Dorenko] Thank you very much. We are ending our meeting with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers, on this sober note of resolution. I wish you great success. Goodbye.

[Silyaev] All the best.

Silayev Urges 'Stern Opposition' to Planning Law

PM2806165191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Ivan Yelistratov and Vladimir Kurasov from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic House of Soviets: "The Russian Council of Ministers Is Authorized to State"]

[Text] From the viewpoint of common sense, it is hard to see why it was that the Law "On the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitutional Court" provoked such resistance on the part of a section of the deputies.

It was discussed in committees and commissions, went through two readings at the republic Supreme Soviet, was submitted for discussion by the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies, and had been deferred because the congress' tight timeframe did not allow the matter to be brought to a conclusion. Now we have had the final debate. In all, 160 amendments. But all the discussion amounted to was the reading out and rejection of the amendments, which occupied practically the entire parliamentary day's work on 27 June. The upshot was that the law was adopted with very minor textual differences from the version that had been approved earlier.

On 28 June the morning sitting of the Russian parliament began with a presentation by RSFSR Council of Ministers Chairman I. Silayev. The Russian premier came to the rostrum in order to secure the deputies' support to oppose the Union Government's actions.

The need for stern opposition, albeit undesirable in today's unstable situation, arose as a result of the Cabinet of Ministers' resolution, adopted in camera, in the spirit of the "good old days," without any coordination with the Union republics' positions. As I. Silayev put it, the Pavlov cabinet "attacked the sovereign republics without declaring war." USSR Cabinet of Ministers Resolution No. 360 "On Organizational Measures To Elaborate Production Programs and Forecasts of the Socioeconomic Development of Enterprises, Regions, Republics, and USSR in the 1992 in Conditions of the Formation of Market Relations" was elaborated as if neither the sovereign republics themselves, nor the Novo-Ogarevo agreements, nor the program of joint actions agreed with the republics had ever existed. As a result, the introduction of the new taxation system alone will cost the Russian budget over 73 billion rubles.

Silayev also announced that the Russian Council of Ministers had adopted its own resolution which, in particular, regards the aforementioned USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution as an abdication of the principles that recently emerged of cooperation and quest for mutually acceptable solutions.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet supported the Russian Government's position.

Coalition Government Agreement Being Drafted

LD2906145991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] As the Russian Information Agency reports, a draft agreement is being prepared between Boris Yeltsin, Russian president-elect, and the parties which proposed his candidacy on forming a coalition administration. This has been reported by Oleg Rumyantsev, member of the presidium of the Social Democratic Party of Russia. He spoke at a plenum of the administration of this party which opened in Moscow today. Oleg Rumyantsev stressed the need to reorientate the party to Union-wide activity as, in his words, no reforms are possible without a radical change in the center.

Yeltsin Thanks Campaign Workers at Soiree

LD2906144191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1135 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Excerpts] A soiree was held yesterday at the capital's cinema center for election campaign participants and public movements involved in electing Boris Yeltsin as president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. USSR and Russian people's deputies, figures from the field of culture and the arts, and people who had taken part in preparing for and holding the election campaign were present in the auditorium. [passage omitted]

[Begin Yeltsin recording] Dear fellow campaigners: This was indeed the first direct secret ballot of all of the Russian people in the 1,000-year history of Russia. They have made their choice. Their main choice was a triumph in favor of a program of the further democratization of Russia, for (?unique) reforms, a multiplicity of forms of ownership, for a better life, and for the contents of the program of the Russian Supreme Soviet and Government.

It was a difficult campaign, a difficult one. Some of our main rivals were fielded against us. Incapable of winning alone, they had been grouped together by the center. [passage indistinct]

So the main work still lies ahead. [passage indistinct] Not a single day must be lost. [passage indistinct] I want to thank the very many thousands of people who were in charge of the election campaign. [end recording]

Yeltsin Arrives in Novosibirsk 1 July

LD0107083391 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 1 Jul 91

[By correspondent Viktor Yelmakov]

[Text] Novosibirsk July 1 TASS—Russian president-elect Boris Yeltsin arrived here today to attend a meeting of the inter-regional association "Siberian Agreement". The association, grouping 17 republics, territories and regions, is set to promote horizontal economic ties.

The Russian Republic leader also plans to visit during his two- day trip the Akademgorodok scientific community of the siberian branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences and meet workers of a machine-making plant and representatives of the region's work collectives and public organisations.

'Who's Who' Features Leningrad's Sobchak

LD2906094391

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central First Program Network in Russian at 1846 GMT on 25 June broadcasts the 72-minute "Who's Who" program, featuring Leningrad Mayor A.A. Sobchak interviewed by commentator Igor Fenusenko in the studio. Fenusenko asks of Sobchak questions that have been mailed and telephoned in by viewers. In addition occasional film clips of Leningraders are shown, in which they give their opinions of Sobchak.

Fesunenko introduces Sobchak, then presents a film sequence about Leningrad, on the spot interviews with locals praising Sobchak, and scenes of Sobchak acting in his official capacity.

Fesunenko then puts viewers' questions to Sobchak: What specifically does he intend to do now that he is mayor? Sobchak answers that he intends to ensure that work actually gets done to improve people's lives—for example, road repairs will be speeded up. He says he will try to ensure that decisions are made more quickly, and acted upon. Sobchak says he will not be copying Moscow in giving free transport to pensioners, as the city cannot afford it.

A video clip then shows an interview with Nina Aleksandrovna Andreyeva, chairman of the All-Union Society of Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals. Andreyeva says: "The present Leningrad Soviet and its leader Sobchak are the products of the bourgeois-restorationist perestroyka. They are not only its products—I would say they are its locomotives, too. For today this perestroyka, which Western communists call Gorbastroyka, has come to a dead end and state of crisis. Sobchak and those who, so to speak, think like him spend a lot of time abroad. I think they go there not only to acquire for themselves, personally, and for their families various goods in short supply, which ordinary people cannot buy anywhere today, but also—one can say this with total justification—in order to hold consultations abroad, consultations on the subject of how to further ruin our Soviet Union. For in essence all the sessions of the Leningrad Soviet, which we see constantly on television, have simply turned into a talking shop. They do not solve a single problem. The reason is that they have no interest in ensuring that the inhabitants of the city live better. They are not engaged in resolving these problems, of which there are very many in the city. They resolve their own personal problems, enriching themselves, raising their prestige, and grabbing as much as possible for themselves."

Andreyeva goes on to deny that Sobchak has the support of the majority of Leningraders. She says: "Who supports him? Only chatterers and demagogues."

Writer V.V. Konetskiy, in a filmed interview, then praises Sobchak.

Back in the studio, Sobchak answers a question about the alleged sale of a Leningrad island to a French company. A joint company has been set up to restore it as a leisure complex, he says.

Suslov, director of the Hermitage museum, then says in a filmed interview that he has hopes of a sympathetic approach to funding from Sobchak.

Sobchak then discusses the referendum result on the possible renaming of Leningrad, and who has the authority to effect the change. On the subject of changing the city's name, Sobchak says: "The majority of Leningraders came out in favor of returning to the city its original name—not the name of the Emperor Peter, but the name of the holy Apostle Peter, after whom the city was named. We do not see anything anti-Lenin in this action. In our city no one has destroyed or desecrated monuments of Lenin. We have not renamed or closed any of the tens of museums or memorial sites devoted to Lenin. Moreover—and I have already spoken of this—the city is prepared today to fulfill Lenin's final wish: his desire to be buried, in accordance with our Christian and national traditions, in Sankt Peterburg at Volkovskoye Cemetery, alongside the tomb of his mother and sister. I think that the time has come to carry out the will of this great man."

Fesunenko then reads out a series of questions from viewers about the events in Tbilisi in April, 1989, and the assessment given by Procurator General Trubin. Fesunenko says: "You are the head of the parliamentary commission which subsequently set out its results to the Congress of Peoples Deputies. There has now been an investigation by the Procuracy. This is a question from a group of veterans of the war and the Armed Forces—Comrades Devyatirikov, Malikov, and Chepikov. They ask you directly, once again citing the Procuracy's investigation: Material has been published on the reasons for, and those guilty of, the events of 9 April in Tbilisi. They do not confirm the conclusions about these events drawn by the commission which you head. In this connection when will you, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, announce your resignation as peoples deputy, for falsifying these events which led to the disorientation of the Soviet people?"

Sobchak replies: "O.K. I have come up against these accusations on several occasions, and would like to say the following: In my view the whole problem, and much of what is happening today, too, in Georgia, is taking place because the decisions of the parliamentary commission, confirmed by a decision of the Congress of Peoples Deputies, were not implemented. For in our conclusions we named quite specific names of party, state, and military officials who violated the relevant orders. But not one of them was brought to account in any way—either administrative, and not to mention criminal, account.

"When Katusev, the chief military procurator, spoke at that congress, he said that the Procuracy had data about the actions of extremists—that there were groups of militants, that this was a provocation, that the Procuracy had quite specific data and therefore that the Procuracy was carrying out an investigation and would publish this data. A year has passed, and the data has been published. What do they consist of? In over 140 volumes of the case it turns out that everything that happened there happened absolutely correctly, and that there are no guilty. Our military Procuracy forgot about the promises to unmask the extremists and militants. There are no guilty either from the side.... [changes thought] All the decisions were made correctly—by the military in the use of troops against the peaceful population, and by party and state bodies beginning from Comrades Chebrikov and Ligachev—they all behaved absolutely correctly. The only ones who were guilty were the victims of these events—those women and adolescents who died on that square. I consider that the conclusion that was published by the procurator general was a conclusion, just like many others, on many other interethnic conflicts, which

was fruitless." Sobchak says he hopes that the next congress will insist on the resignation of Katusev. "Furthermore, I will publish all the material of the work of the parliamentary commission, including the protocols of the expanations given by the members of the Politburo and the generals, and the relevant orders, so that people can judge for themselves where the truth is and where is the lie."

In reply to a question about his approval of military patrols in Leningrad, Sobchak says they will be helpful on, for example, late night suburban trains. Asked about his nationality, Sobchak relates that his ancestry is very mixed, but he regards himself as Russian.

In filmed interviews Sobchak's wife and daughter regret that his duties keep him away from his family.

Outlining his view of the future, Sobchak then says that the time has come to move on from talking to specific actions, based on Yavlinskiy's economic program.

Fesunenko then concludes the program, saying that the next program will be broadcast on 9 July. There will be three guests—I.D. Laptev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and two ballet stars, Vladimir Vasilyev and Yekaterina Maksimova.

Sobchak Sorbonne Remarks on Gorbachev Quoted

PM2806114891 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Various Radio Stations" citing RADIO FRANCE INTERNATIONAL, incorporating remarks by "Leningrad-Saint Petersburg" Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak at the Sorbonne and interview with Sobchak by unidentified correspondent—date, place of interview not stated: "Breakfast at the Sorbonne. A. Sobchak on M. Gorbachev and Himself"]

[Text] RADIO FRANCE INTERNATIONAL reported Anatoliy Sobchak's speech at the Sorbonne. Breakfast debates are traditionally organized here; this time they "invited the mayor of Leningrad-Saint Petersburg to breakfast at the Sorbonne." He told those assembled about the current situation in the Soviet Union, and in the course of answering questions described M.S. Gorbachev in an original manner.

"...When talking about the transformations, it is, of course, naive to think that Gorbachev personally implemented all the reforms on his own. Of course, Gorbachev's contribution in implementing these reforms is immense, and probably no one but Gorbachev would have succeeded in carrying out so quickly the transition from the position society was in 1985, to what we have in politics in 1991....

"Talking about Gorbachev today, it seems to me that Gorbachev first and foremost feels himself to be in a situation where the most bitter political struggle is going on, and in his approach to this, he maneuvers between left and right.

"I'd like to remind you of the humorous song by our satirist Zhvanetskiy. It is called 'Admiration, or Worship of Gorbachev' and goes like this. I'll quote only the principal, the main part: 'To the left-wingers—he is a right-winger; to the right-wingers—he's a left-winger; and to himself he represents the center, but that is an optical illusion.'"

[Unidentified correspondent] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, if in a year's time time there are elections for USSR president, do you see yourself among the possible candidates?

[Sobchak] Well, I'd prefer to answer these questions in the following way. Let's wait and see. Talking about such things ahead of time is in the realm of political astrology.

[Correspondent] But you don't rule out....

[Sobchak] I'm a realist.

[Correspondent] But you don't rule out the possibility?

[Sobchak] I think that's enough of that.

Sobchak Makes Congratulatory Speech for Yeltsin

LD3006082191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1135 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Speech by Anatoliy Sobchak, mayor of "the city on the Neva" (Leningrad), at the victory meeting for Boris Yeltsin in Moscow on 28 June—recorded]

[Text] To congratulate Russia's elected president, Anatoliy Sobchak, the mayor of the city on the Neva, came to the meeting.

[Begin Sobchak recording] Our great emperor, Petr Alekseyevich, tried for more than 10 years to carry out reforms in Moscow, but later became convinced that in view of the resistance of Moscow boyars [applause] it was a completely hopeless cause, so he came to the banks of the Neva. But do not be in a hurry: I do not at all want to call for the transfer of the capital of Russia to our city, since all the reforms, beginning with the reforms of Petr Alekseyevich, have begun in Petersburg and have all ended in failure, ending with the latest reform begun in October 1917. [applause] Let us therefore think together: Perhaps we should begin our reforms, which will lead to the creation of a truly great Russia, at once—from Leningrad to Kamchatka, to Sakhalin, to Vladivostok—across our whole great land. Perhaps then they will be completed successfully.

There will still be much ahead of us: renaming and burial, and the revival of the glorious traditions of our people. But there is nothing more important today than that we should all, together, along with our respected President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, and all the others

in whom the people has put its trust and whom the people believe in, concern ourselves with the needs of the ordinary and great people of our land. These are people who know how to work, how to suffer, how to create a great culture, how to create great literature, how to make great discoveries, and how to do all to ensure that our land is great and abundant and that there is order in it at last. [end recording]

Sobchak Inaugurated as Leningrad Mayor

LD2906102591 Moscow TASS in English 0603 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Fomicheva]

[Text] Anatoliy Sobchak on Wednesday received a certificate of Leningrad mayor at an inauguration ceremony at the Mariinsk Palace in Leningrad.

A certificate was also presented to Leningrad Vice-Mayor Vyacheslav Shcherbakov.

The ceremony was attended by Chairman of the City Election Commission Vladimir Fomichev, people's deputies, artists, scientists, foreign guests and journalists.

Sobchak said the new city administration has a programme to revive the city, including through broad cooperation with foreign countries.

The programme envisages a drastic reorganisation of the city executive office. The appointment of director of Leningrad's Russian Museum Vladimir Gusev chairman of a committee for culture to be set up in the city is the first step in this direction.

Taking into account Leningraders' numerous appeals, the new city administration has set up a committee for city conveniences and endowed it with broad powers.

Sobchak answered Soviet and foreign correspondents' questions, spoke on the public and political situation in the country, the free enterprise zone to be set up in Leningrad and on the development of business cooperation with foreign countries.

PRAVDA Views Leningrad Name Change

PM3006182391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by N. Volynskiy: "With Icy Indifference. At the Leningrad City Soviet Session"]

[Text] The routine, ninth session of the Leningrad City Soviet began sluggishly, even tediously, yesterday. Clearly, many deputies are subdued because the new mayor intends to strip the local parliament of a sizable portion of its powers.

But the deputies livened up considerably later when the question of renaming the city came up for discussion. And you can only marvel at the flippancy with which the homegrown parliamentarians adopted a decision which bears tremendous historical responsibility. They "did not notice" the fact that only one-third of the total number of voters opted for St. Petersburg. One in ten made a mistake because of the obscure wording on the ballot paper. The votes of those who went to the polling places were divided almost equally. So how can a decision be made? The Leningrad City Soviet ignored the opinion of oblast inhabitants too. Finally, no consideration was given to the multitude of absurdities which a change of name entails. Are we to talk about "the hero city of St. Petersburg" or "St. Petersburg—center of Leningrad Oblast"?

At first, the deputies decided to allot exactly 30 minutes to the discussion on the name change. Then they abandoned it altogether. They decided to ask the USSR Supreme Soviet to "restore St. Petersburg." Which, incidentally, is illegal: It was the Congress of Soviets which decided to rename the city Leningrad, and only an all-Union Congress has the power to repeal this decision.

Caucasus

Georgia Appeals to UN for Support, Membership

AU2906132291 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0200 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Excerpts] As we informed you yesterday, the regular meeting of the first session of the Georgian Supreme Council began its work in Tbilisi. [passage omitted]

The Supreme Council adopted the following message to the United Nations Organization:

The Georgian people have a history of democratic statehood that stretches back many centuries. The Democratic Republic of Georgia, which was in existence between 1918 and 1921, was recognized by many countries in the world and by the League of Nations.

This country, which was annexed by Bolshevik Russia, has again expressed its firm will and has restored its statehood that it lost 70 years ago. The people living in Georgia clearly expressed their will and wish in the multiparty elections to the Supreme Council on 28 October 1990, in the referendum of 31 March 1991, and in the universal direct presidential elections of 26 May 1991 that were the first to be held not only in Georgia but also in the whole history of the former Soviet Union.

Fulfilling the will of the people, the Republic of Georgia Supreme Council legally restored its democratic statehood with the act of 9 April 1991 and has embarked upon the path of its de facto restoration.

Striving to occupy its appropriate place among the world's democratic countries, the Republic of Georgia recognizes the primacy of international law both in its domestic and foreign policy and expresses its readiness to be included, in the most immediate future, in the most important conventions, declarations, and pacts of international law and in their ratification.

The Republic of Georgia Supreme Council calls upon the United Nations to support Georgia's struggle for independence and, in so doing, to help in establishing democracy and a stable situation in the country.

A clear sign of your support would be to invite representatives of the Republic of Georgia to participate in the numerous and (?complex) activities of the United Nations Organization. [passage omitted]

Nagorno-Karabakh Village Attacked 28 Jun

LD2906194791 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Report by Nagorno-Karabakh correspondent A. Mamedov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Video shows aerial shots of mountain village; scenes of destruction in the village; corpse of a dead cow; villagers mourning] The Azerbaijan settlement of Karadagly in Martuni Rayon of the autonomous oblast has been subjected more than once to attacks by bandit formations which are even now filtering through with mountain troops from neighboring Armenia. At 0130 on 28 June they again made their presence felt, subjecting this village to bombardment from automatic weapons, grenade launchers, and mortars. Buildings have been destroyed and there are people seriously wounded.

As later became clear, however, this was a kind of a diversion maneuver. The kolkhoz several kilometers from the village was the main target of the bandits' attack. The staff at the farm—three women and three men—were shot at point-blank range and then set afire. Only fascists could permit themselves such actions. The boundless deeds of the terrorists have brought to 12 the number of people who have died in this small village. Unfortunately, these scum, who proudly call themselves fedainy and who at the same time drive off the kolkhoz's cattle, have not yet been detained. I am sure this tragedy could have been prevented if the servicemen of the Martuni commandant's office for the emergency situation had been more prompt. Having received the terrible signal of attack, they did not arrive in the village of Karadagly until several hours later although they were only 10 km away from the scene of the tragedy.

Official Says Firms Under Azerbaijan Authority

NC3006124091 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] Yerevan, 26 Jun (ARMENPRES)—According to a report published in the HAYASTAN newspaper, Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party, has said that all enterprises in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] will be reverted to the control of Azerbaijani ministries and departments. He said that if the Armenians do not like it they should move out of NKAO.

As part of the execution of this threat, not a single kopeck is being allotted to the Stepanakert bank. All financial operations have been halted and employees have not received their salaries for months.

Despite all these facts, the Armenian side is exerting efforts to sit at the negotiations table.

Eleven militia workers from Kirovakan who were taken hostage have been released. Koryun Martirosyan and Gevorg Akopdzhanyan were among those released. PRAVDA, the central organ of CPSU, accused them of being "Armenian guerrillas."

Even though the people of NKAO are inclined to sit at the negotiating table, the other side is still instigating armed conflicts. The Armenian Avdur and Myurishen villages came under machine gun and automatic weapon fire from the Azerbaijani settlement of Gyulably in Agdamskiy rayon. The shooting stopped only after the arrival of the Internal Affairs Ministry troops.

[Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian at 1215 GMT on 25 June reports: "There is has been a tangible reduction in the number of illegal actions on interethnic grounds in Nagorno- Karabakh. However, the economic instability is preventing the elimination of the social tension in the oblast." The report adds: "The abnormal economic situation in Nagorno-Karabakh will continue as long as the constitutional structures of power are not restored. As such, the autonomous oblast's Armenian leadership, which has come forward in favor of commencing a dialogue, hopes for a reciprocal constructive stance from the authorities of the Azerbaijani Republic."]

Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Receives French Group

NC3006135591 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Excerpts] Yerevan, 27 Jun (ARMENPRES)—Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet, yesterday received a French parliamentary delegation led by Rene Rouguet, head of French Parliament's working group on Armenian affairs. The delegation also comprises Richard Gazenave, Michel Bezen, Pierre Giard, Charles Armand, and Claude Isahak Sibil, members of the French Parliament's foreign affairs commission and the working group. [passage omitted]

Before answering the guests' questions, Levon Ter-Petrosyan emphasized that he is aware of the close attention with which French Government circles follow the general public reaction toward recent developments, and noted with satisfaction that the dramatic incidents of April and May were assessed correctly as a new wave of atrocities unleashed by the center against Armenia's independence struggle.

He underlined that while the republic's authorities are totally opposed to creating artificial confrontations with

the center and are prepared for negotiations and mutual concessions, they will not make unilateral concessions at the expense of the people's sacred aspirations.

Clarifying the distinctive characteristics of our chosen course of independence, Levon Ter-Petrosyan stressed that the five-year transition period established by the union law is fully in line with the interests of Armenia, which will use this time to create the real prerequisites and guarantees it needs for its independence. The most important task here is, no doubt, building stable relations with neighboring countries in the face of historical antagonisms and prejudices.

He then noted that the republics which have chosen democracy have a right to expect that international public opinion will work to constrain the center from committing the new atrocities that always accompany the violation of basic human rights. The West cannot regard this as a mere internal issue. As such, Ter-Petrosyan continued, international organizations as well as government bodies must concentrate on humanitarian efforts to secure the return of the deportees from Nagorno-Karabakh to their homes and to obtain the release of the Armenian citizens who were taken hostage. It was underlined that despite the measures taken by the republic's leadership, dozens of people remain in Azerbaijani cells, a situation which is a gross violation not only of union law but also of every accepted international norm. [passage omitted]

Mutalibov Warns Against Separatists in Azerbaijan

NC0107103991 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Excerpt] President Ayaz Mutalibov received the representatives of the (?Lazgi) people in Baku on 25 June. A frank discussion was held. The participants of the meeting discussed a number of matters related to the cultural and social development of the (?Lazgi) people in the republic. While replying to their questions, Polat Bulbuloglu, minister of culture; Rafik Feyzullayev, minister of public education; and Abdullayev, secretary of the petroleum workers union, explained the work which has been implemented and that planned for the future.

President Mutalibov detailed tasks related to consolidating the work carried out with the republic's national minorities. He recalled the claim that the frequent ethnic disputes in the country were caused by the accumulated problems, noting that the combatant (?stand) of the Soviet peoples during the war for the fatherland constitutes a convincing confirmation of the fact that such claims are unfounded. Regarding the recent incidents, he asserted that they have been caused by the disruptive activities of the (?separatist) elements, which have taken advantage of the democratization and openness process to rebel. The incidents in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast are an example. We have observed that the separatist activities [words indistinct]. We support the development of all the national minorities in the republic in the cultural and social fields. The roots of each and every effort to put forward land claims against the republic, however, will be resolutely eradicated. [passage omitted]

Central Asia

Kazakhstan Seeks Union Treaty Amendments

PM3006141391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS correspondent T. Zhurbenko report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "They Will Sign the Treaty, But..."]

[Text] Alma-Ata—Kazakhstan will sign the Union treaty only on condition that certain amendments are made—that is the decision that was reached by the republic Supreme Soviet deputies who examined this question at parliament's fourth session.

As is well known, the basic provisions of this document were agreed at Novo-Ogarevo and were submitted for examination to the parliaments of the country and the republics. And it was while the articles were being studied in detail at local level that questions arose. Kazakh deputies proved to be no exception, fully sharing President N.A. Nazarbayev's doubts.

While deeming the current version to be "the most democratic version and one which sufficiently reflects nations' rights to self-determination," the republic's president dwelt in particular on the expediency of defining more clearly the concept of parties to the treaty. According to the head of Kazakhstan, only republics that directly form the Union should be parties.

The numerical representation of delegates from autonomous and territorial-national formations in the supreme organ of power also needs to be clarified.

The concept of "joint ownership" on republics' territories also arouses objections, the president noted. And, finally, special attention was paid to the formation of the country's budget. Although it supports the idea of a federal tax in principle, the president said, Kazakhstan cannot agree with the mechanism for levying it. The tax system proposed by the country's Cabinet of Ministers will effectively impoverish the republic.

Having discussed these proposals and others made by the republic president, the deputies adopted a resolution which by and large approves the draft Union treaty. A plenipotentiary delegation headed by N. Nazarbayev was formed and intends to defend Kazakhstan's interests.

Approves Privatization Program

OW0107075591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1100 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Thursday Kazakhstan's parliament approved a program for denationalizing and privatizing state property. The first phase of the program is to be implemented in 1991 and 1992. A report on this was delivered by Kazakhstan's President Nursultan Nazarbayev.

The 1st phase provides for privatizing shops and other trade organizations, catering centers, services, municipal facilities, small factoires, small building organizations, motor transport, farms and housing run by the state.

Big and medium-size facilities will be turned into collective enterprises and joint-stock societies.

Privatization will be carried out by auction, contests and sales of shares. Access to all this will be granted first of all to people who have lived in Kazakhstan for at leaast 5 years. After 1992 access will be granted to physical and juridical persons from other Soviet republics and foreign countries.

What will not be subject to privatization and denationalization at the 1st phase are the major medical institutions, educational institutions, communication facilties, power plants, TV and radio stations, railways and civil aviation.

The same day MPs [members of parliament] approved in principle a bill on public associations in Kazakhstan.

The bill prohibits to form public organizations whose programs incite racial, ethnic, social or religious hatred, including class exclusiveness, proclaim methods of changing the constitutional system by force, call for violating the USSR's or Kazakhstan's territorial integrity, advocate war of allow for abuse of human rights and freedoms.

Interference of state institutions and public organizations in each other's affairs is prohibited.

Under the bill servicemen and government employees, such as law-enforcers, should not be bound by decisions taken by political parties, public movements and other mass associations.

Kyrgyzstan President Praises Union Treaty

LD2906080291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Akayev, president of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, highly praised the draft Union treaty. He addressed the republican Supreme Soviet session today. It is one of the main aims of the draft treaty to set up a new, genuinely Union interrepublican center subordinate to the republics, noted the president. Apart from that, the draft provides for a possibility of a broad expansion of direct economic, political, and humanitarian ties among the republics. The Supreme Soviet of Kyrgyzstan has, by a majority of votes, approved the draft Union treaty and has set up a plenipotentiary commission entrusted with signing the documents.

Tajik Deputies Support Draft Union Treaty

LD2706223991 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 0005 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] As the dear listeners know, in these days in the city of Dushanbe the 6th session of the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan of the 12th convocation is continuing. Today the session is continuing its work. Yesterday the deputies first expressed their views on the speech delivered by Prime Minister Khayayev about the steps for taking the economy out of the crisis under the conditions of transfer to market relations. Twelve of the 26 deputies who wanted to speak on this question were able to speak. All of them put forward their proposals for tackling this question. Prime Minister Khayayev answered their questions and expressed his views on the various proposals. The deputies then adopted a decision on the basis of the observations, views, changes and additions put forward.

After the interval the deputies started the examination of the third item on the agenda—the draft Union treaty. President Kakhar Makhkamov, spoke first on this issue. The deputies then put questions to him and received answers. They expressed their views on the draft Union treaty. At the proposal of the deputies the examination of the draft treaty was stopped and it was put to the vote; 181 deputies supported the union treaty. Today the deputies will be examining a few draft laws on the basis of the session agenda.

Tajik Supreme Soviet Lifts State of Emergency

LD2906163791 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 29 Jun 91

[By TADZHIKTA-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Dushanbe June 29 TASS—The Supreme Soviet (parliament) of Tajikistan lifted today the state of emergency in the capital of that Soviet Central Asian republic. It was imposed on February 12, 1990 during massive unrest that led to the loss oflife. The decision of the parliament is the result of the stabilisation of a public and political situation in the republic.

Confirms KGB Appointment

LD2806220191 Moscow TASS in English 1927 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Dushanbe June 28 TAJIKTA-TASS—The Tajik Parliament on Friday confirmed General Anatoliy Stroikin's appointment as new head of the republic's State Security Committee.

Stroikin, 55, was appointed by Tajik President Kakhar Makhkamov. Previously, he had worked as head of a regional KGB committee in Kazakhstan.

Turkminstan's Muradov Supports Union Treaty

LD2806215191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] The leader of the Turkmenian parliament, Mr. Sakhat Muradov, has said the new Union treaty must be signed as soon as possible because it is in accord with the main interests of the Soviet people, including Turkmenia. He said his republic had no objections to the treaty's main provisions, but some of its articles are being reviewed from the point of view of Turkmenia's interests.

Turkmenia is one of the Soviet republics in Central Asia.

More on Treaty Support

LD2906051691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1220 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent L. Glazovskaya]

[Text] Ashkhabad, 28 Jun (TASS)—"The Union treaty must be signed as quickly as possible, for it meets the fundamental interests of the peoples of our country, including the Turkmen people and the whole multiethnic population of Soviet Turkmenia," stated Sakhat Muradov, chairman of the Turkmenian Supreme Soviet, in a conversation with a TASS correspondent.

This opinion, in his words, reflects the striving of all of the peoples of Turkmenia for the preservation of the Union as a renewed federation of sovereign states with equal rights. They came out in favor of precisely this, by a majority of votes, when the all-Union referendum was held.

"As far as the basic principles set out in the draft treaty are concerned, these are not causing objections in the republic," the leader of the Turkmen Supreme Soviet stressed. "The transfer of all functions to a plenipotentiary delegation of Turkmenia, which was headed by Saparmurat Niyazov, its president, was a measure of confidence by the parliament of the republic in the work carried out on the preparation of the document. At the present time, work is being finished on a number of points in the document from the point of view of observing the interests of the republic. However, whatever differences there might be, they may be overcome only on the basis of a treaty or legal act. It is precisely this that the document should become. The necessity for this is noted in the whole course of history."